DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 227 511 CS 207 415

AUTHOR White, Edward M.
TITLE Comparison and Contrast: The 1980 and 1981 California State University and Colleges Freshman English Equivalency Examination.
INSTITUTION California State Univ. and Colleges, Long Beach.; English Council of the California State Univ. and Colleges.
PUB DATE 82
NOTE 152p.; For related documents, see ED 114 825-826 and CS 207 410-414.
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC07 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS College Freshmen; Educational Testing; *Equivalency Tests; *Essay Tests; Higher Education; Objective Tests; Scoring; State Programs; Student Placement; Test Format; Testing Programs; *Test Interpretation; Test Norms; Test Reliability; *Writing Evaluation; *Writing Research
IDENTIFIERS California

ABSTRACT

The eighth and ninth administrations of the California State University and Colleges Freshman English Equivalency Examination, a test consisting of an objective examination graded by the Educational Testing Service and an essay examination scored by California State University and College faculty, are analyzed in this report. After a preface and short index of previous volumes, the first section of the report contains a summary and fact sheet describing the tests, their results, and studies being completed on the testing program. The next section recounts the actual administration of the tests. The two essay questions used in each test are covered in the five subsections of the next section. In the first four subsections a report from the question leader, the question itself, the directions to graders, and six sample student papers are given for each of the questions, while the fifth lists the essay readers for both years. Section four presents statistical reports on the two examinations. The report's five appendixes cover a variety of topics including the budget, course credit for the examination, and descriptive statistics for both examination years. (JL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED227511

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

COMPARISON AND CONTRAST

THE 1980 AND 1981 CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY AND COLLEGES FRESHMAN ENGLISH EQUIVALENCY EXAMINATION

EDWARD M. WHITE

DIRECTOR OF THE PROJECT

FOR

THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Linda Bunnell Jones

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

CS207457

This monograph is one in a series describing the results of projects implemented under the California State University Fund for Innovation and Improvement in the Instructional Process.

1982 Trustees of The California State University

PREFACE

This report describes the eighth and ninth administrations of The California State University Freshman English Equivalency Examination. The development and initial implementation of the program are fully described in the first volume of Comparison and Contrast, which describes the 1973 program. The further development of the program is described in the separate volumes of Comparison and Contrast, 1974-79. Since this 1980-81 volume will not repeat material already published in earlier reports, anyone seeking a full account of the development of the English Equivalency Examination should acquire the earlier volumes from the Office of the Chancellor, The California State University, 400 Golden Shore, Long Beach, California, 90802.

Following the Table of Contents in this volume is a list of materials published in earlier reports that may be of particular interest to those receiving this report, which will go into detail only when new problems or new solutions occurred in 1980 or 1981. This report does contain the essay questions that were used in 1980 and 1981, the criteria for scoring, and six sample papers at the different score levels for each question. It also contains descriptive statistics for both tests, statistical reports, and norm figures. This volume is larger than past ones, since it combines two reports in one volume. It does not, however, contain the usual in-progress report of the 1973 follow-up study, since that study is nearing completion, and we expect that it will be published as a separate volume in 1982; it will detail the subsequent performance on a wide range of criteria of the total accessible 1973 test group.

Finally, it is worthy of note that, as the teaching and measurement of writing skills becomes more and more important at the college and university level, the English Equivalency Examination has served to involve a substantial number of university-level English faculty in the preparation and scoring of an essay examination according to the highest professional and psychometric standards. The continuing dialogue among the professionals involved in this program on all CSU campuses has had a substantial effect on the teaching of writing and the teachers of writing throughout the state of California. It may turn out that this "in-service training" by-product of English Equivalency will be the most important educational impact of the program. At the same time, we should not minimize the effect of the program upon the substantial numbers of students who have directly benefited from it.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
	Preface	i
	Short Index of Previous Volumes	iii
I.	Summary and Fact Sheets	1
II.	Administration of the Test Program	12
III.	The Essay Test	15
	A. Question 1 - 1980	16
	a. Report by Question Leader: Dr. Eileen Lothamer	16
	b. Question 1	17
	c. Directions to Graders	18
	d. Six Sample Student Papers	19
	B. Question 2 - 1980	24
	a. Report by Question Leader: Dr. Rex Burbank	24
	b. Question 2	27
	c. Directions to Graders	28
	d. Six Sample Student Papers	29
	C. Question 1 - 1981	32
	a. Report by Question Leader: Dr. Rex Burbank	32
	b. Question 1	36
	c. Directions to Graders	36
	d. Six Sample Student Papers	38
	D. Question 2 - 1981	45
	a. Report by Question Leader: Dr. Eileen Lothamer	45
	b. Question 2	48
	c. Directions to Graders	50
	d. Six Sample Student Papers	51
	E. Table/Reader Charts	
	a. Table/Reader Chart - 1980	56
	b. Table/Reader Chart - 1981	58
IV.	Statistical Report - Dr. Robert Bradley	
	A. Statistical Report - 1980	59
	B. Statistical Report - 1981	74
	APPENDICES	
	A. Budget	91
	B. Report of the EEE Assessment Committee to the CSUC English Council, April, 1980	92
	C. Course Credit for the EEE on CSUC campuses	94
	D. Descriptive Statistics	
	a. Descriptive Statistics - 1980 Administration	95
	b. Descriptive Statistics - 1981 Administration	118
	E. EEE Readers/Table Leaders, 1973-1981	130

SHORT INDEX OF PREVIOUS VOLUMES

Comparison and Contrast

1973, 1974, 1975, 1976, 1977, 1978, 1979

1. Summary and Fact Sheet

1973: 1 - 13
1974: 1 - 4
1975: 1 - 4
1976: 3 - 6
1977: 1 - 4
1978: 1 - 8
1979: 1 - 7

2. The Objective Test

1973: 28 - 30
1974: 13

3. The Essay Test: Reports, Questions, Sample Responses

1973: 30 - 61
1974: 15 - 39
1975: 19 - 36
1976: 11 - 26
1977: 7 - 18
1978: 11 - 32
1979: 10 - 31

4. Descriptive Statistics and Statistician's Reports

1973: 79 - 93, 132 - 167
1974: VII - XX, xxiii - xxxvi
1975: 51 - 68
1976: 31 - 47, 84 - 97
1977: 20 - 28
1978: 33 - 48, 55 - 74
1979: 32 - 45, 49 - 70

5. Norm Samples

1973: 51 - 61 (7 CSUC campuses + UCLA and UCR)
1974: 41 - 49, VII - XI (San Jose State, Stanford, UCR, UCSB, UCLA)
1975: 54 - 62 (San Francisco State; CSU, Long Beach)
1976: 32 - 38 (CSU Northridge, CSU, Chico)

1977: 21 - 32 (CSU, Fullerton; CSU, Long Beach)
1978: 34 - 44 (CSU, Northridge; CSU, Fresno; San Jose State)
1979: 36 - 44 (Bakersfield State; CSU, Sacramento; CSU, San Diego)

6. Follow-up Studies

1975: 71 - 91
1976: 48 - 63
1977: 33 - 48

7. Reports, Appendices, and Charts

- Equivalency Testing in College Freshman English

1973: 94 - 125

- Budgets

1973: 126 - 131
1974: XXI
1975: 93
1976: 64
1977: 48
1978: 49
1979: 46 - 48

- Registration Form

1974: 7
1975: 7 - 10

- English Council Committee Reports

1974: 13
1975: 12 - 16, 17 - 18
1978: 53 - 54

- Organizational Charts

1975: 94 - 98
1976: 65
1977: 19
1978: 32
1979: 31

- Media and Student Questionnaires

1975: 99 - 100
1978: 50

- Data Processing Procedures

  1975: 37 - 50

- Four Issues for Faculty in Equivalency Testing

  1975: 101 - 111

- The Working of a Controlled Essay Reading

  1976: 68 - 75

- Son of EEE: The English Placement Test

  1977: 57 - 58

- The 1977 English Equivalency Reliability Study

  1977: 51 - 54

SUMMARY AND FACT SHEET

Both the 1980 and 1981 English Equivalency Examinations proceeded smoothly, following, in general, the precedents established during previous administrations. The upturn in enrollment that began in 1978 continued in 1980, with a 43% increase over the 1979 enrollment, and over 100% that of the low point in 1977. That increase would have been maintained in 1981, but budgetary restrictions forced us to return all late registrations, in order to keep the number of essays within the limited allocation of funds for scoring. It would be encouraging to think that renewed attention to writing in the schools, as shown, for example, by increased English requirements and the California Writing Project, has increased the number of students who can profit by the EEE. Another possible reason for the increase may be the extra attention the CSU directors of admission have begun to give to ensuring statewide distribution of the test brochure. The institution of the English Placement Test requirement has also drawn additional attention to the EEE, which offers EPT exemption to those who pass. The EEE seems to have become an established part of California education, increasingly well-known.

Certainly, one major indication of the continued success of the program is the number of times it is mentioned as a model for new testing programs, both statewide and on individual campuses. With large-scale testing programs in English now underway in the CSU and in many other areas of education, the English Equivalency model and experience has become an extremely important base upon which to develop new programs. Increasingly, professional journals refer to the program, either by notes or in full-scale articles. (See e.g., the Journal of Basic Studies, spring--summer, 1978, pp. 18-38; the Council of Writing Program Administratiors Journal, spring, 1980, pp. 19-22.)

The following chart compares the number of applicants, and their success rates, across the nine years of the English Equivalency Examination program. It shows the decline in number of enrollments until 1977, partially compensated for by the increasing percentage of passing scores. The decline in the passing rate to 1980 is discussed below in the statistical report. It is worth noting here, however, that a major component of that decline is the continued drop in scores on the multiple-choice portion of the test. Only about 1/2 of the students passing the essay test were able to pass the multiple-choice test as well in 1980, and thus

pass the examination as a whole. In 1981, that figure dropped further, to 42%. Since the multiple-choice test examines the ability to read, particularly to read literature, we need to face the grim possibility that renewed efforts in the schools to improve student writing may be at the expense of instruction in reading.

STUDENTS APPLYING FOR ENGLISH EQUIVALENCY EXAMINATION CREDIT 1973-81

	Number	Number Passing	Percent Passing	Semester Units Earned	Number Passing Only for EPT Exemption
1973	4,072	1,363	33.5	8,178	——
1974	3,639	1,036	28.5	6,216	——
1975	3,303	981	29.7	5,886	——
1976	2,866	1,093	38.1	6,558	——
1977	2,216	883	39.8	5,298	1,104
1978	2,826	1,165	41.3	6,990	1,250
1979	3,346	1,081	32.3	6,486	1,726
1980	4,810	1,417	29.5	8,502	2,290
1981	4,014	1,226	30.5	7,356	1,606
Total (9 yrs.)	31,092	10,245	33.0	61,470	7,976

The multiple-choice test continued to be the CLEP Subject Examination, Analysis and Interpretation of Literature, developed and graded by the Educational Testing Service. The essay test was produced by two CSU Test Development Committees and scored by the California State University faculty at the controlled essay reading at Kellogg-West on the campus of California State Polytechnic University, Pomona, June 14-17, 1980, and June 13-16, 1981.

In addition to the test papers, readers also scored norm samples written by 208 students from three CSU campuses (Bakersfield, Sacramento, San Diego) in 1980, and by 305 students from five campuses (Dominguez Hills, Fullerton, Hayward, Northridge, Pomona) in 1981.

Dr. Robert Bradley, test officer at California State Polytechnic University, Pomona, was once again in charge of the statistical operation. As has been the case in the past, the controlled essay reading achieved an extremely high rate of consistency among the readers. The statistical report estimates the reading reliability of the total essay score at .88 in 1980

and .89 in 1981. The essay scoring followed closely the pattern of previous years. The four independent readings on a 6-point scale were added to yield a single essay test score on a scale from 0-24. In 1980, essay total scores of 15 or above when combined with passing scores on the machine-scored test allowed a student to pass; 176 students with an essay total score of 14, but with objective scores above 53 (that is, above the 75th percentile for the test group) were also allowed to pass. In 1981, essay total scores of 14 or above when combined with passing scores on the machine-scored test allowed a student to pass; 15 students with an essay total score of 13, but with objective scores of 60 or higher were also allowed to pass. The statistical reports (Section IV below) contain detailed discussion of these decisions and of the reasoning behind them.

With the establishment of the English Placement Test in 1977 (a test designed to identify students with poor preparation in English), a second level "placement" pass was established for the EEE. Students passing the EEE at this level were exempted from the required CSU English Placement Test, even though their scores were not high enough to deserve credit. Any student with a total essay score of 15 or higher received a placement pass, whatever the multiple-choice score; an essay score of 12 or higher earned this pass when combined with a multiple-choice score of 35 or higher. When we add the 2290 students (47.6%) who received this placement, or exemption, pass to the 1417 (29.5%) who received credit for freshman English through the English Equivalency Examination, approximately 77% of the 1980 EEE tests received some form of pass--which means that approximately 77% of the test applicants received some substantial benefit from the test. The 1981 figures were similar: 1606 (40.0%) received the placement pass, 1226 (30.5%) passed for credit; over 70% of the 1981 group passed at one or the other level.

Meanwhile, the follow-up study of the 1973 test group (which has been delayed because of Proposition 13 budget cuts) nears completion. When printed, this study should give definite answers to the questions a large-scale equivalency testing program raises for a state university system—in particular to the question of how students gaining credit differ in their course plans and grades from those not gaining credit. The staffing, financial, and educational implications of this study are obviously important. As this volume goes to press, the follow-up study is going into final draft. The statistical analyses have been completed, and conclusions (very supportive of the EEE) have been reached. Separate publication of this study should occur in 1982.

The 1982 English Equivalency Examination will be offered on April 24, 1982 and the essay will once again be scored by CSU faculty in the middle of June. With the 1982 test administration, the EEE will complete its first decade. With budgetary restrictions for all of higher education in the future, it is hard to predict what lies ahead for the EEE. But a decade of solid achievement has been accomplished.

1980 ENGLISH EQUIVALENCY EXAMINATION FACT SHEET

Test Date:	May 3, 1980
Test Used:	CLEP Subject Examination, Analysis and Interpretation of Literature (90 minutes) in combination with Two 45-minute essay questions prepared by CSUC English faculty (90 minutes).
Number of Candidates:	4,810
Number Passed:	1,417
Percentage Passed:	29.5%
Number Exempted from Placement Testing:	2,290
Percentage Receiving Exemption Pass:	47.6%
Number of Semester Credit Units Earned:	8,502

Scoring Data

Minimum Passing Scores for credit	
Objective Part:	45 (CLEP scale) achieved by 52.3%
Essay Part:	15 (out of a possible 24 points; equivalent to 48 on the CLEP scale) achieved by 36.8% (180 additional students with scores of 14 and objective scores of 53 or higher--above the 76th percentile on local norms--also passed).
Combined Score:	97 (49 objective + 48 essay, each on the CLEP scale). 37.2% achieved 49 or better on the objective test, and 36.8% achieved 48 or better on the essay test.

Minimum Passing Scores for EPT exemption

Objective Part:	35
Essay Part:	12 (out of a possible 24 points; equivalent to 36 on the CLEP scale). Thirty additional students with essay scores of 15 or above but with objective scores below 35 also qualified for EPT exemption.

Means and Standard Deviations

Objective Part Mean:	45.486
Standard Deviation:	9.508
Essay Part (Raw) Mean:	13.641
Standard Deviation:	2.711
Essay Part (Converted) Mean:	43.041
Standard Deviation:	9.435
Combined Score Mean:	88.527
Standard Deviation:	16.755

Statistical Data

Correlation between CSUC Essay and CLEP Objective Tests:	.56

Reliability

CLEP Test:	.88
Essay Test:	.765 $\pm$ .115
Composite Score:	.885 $\pm$ .035

Essay Reading

Number of Readers:	40
Number of Colleges Represented:	All 19 CSUC campuses
Grading Scale:	6 point
Number of Readings per test:	4 (2 independent readings for each question; additional readings to reconcile discrepant grades)
Total Essay Readings:	Approximately 20,600
Weighting and Scaling:	The essay score was converted by the equipercentile method to the CLEP scale (20-80), and the scores on both parts of the examination were added. Each part received equal weight.

1981 ENGLISH EQUIVALENCY EXAMINATION FACT SHEET

Test Date:	April 25, 1981
Test Used:	CLEP Subject Examination, Analysis and Interpretation of Literature (90 minutes) in combination with Two 45-minute essay questions prepared by CSUC English faculty (90 minutes).
Number of Candidates:	4,014
Number Passed:	1,226
Percentage Passed:	30.5%
Number Exempted from Placement Testing:	1,606
Percentage Receiving Exemption Pass:	40%
Number of Semester Credit Units Earned:	7,356
Scoring Data	
Minimum Passing Scores for credit	
Objective Part:	43 (CLEP scale) achieved by 55.2%
Essay Part:	14 (out of a possible 24 points; equivalent to 45 on the CLEP scale) achieved by 44.7% (16 additional students with scores of 13 and objective scores of 60 or higher--above the 85th percentile on national norms--also passed).
Combined Score:	92 (47 objective + 45 essay, each on the CLEP scale). 38.4% achieved 47 or better on the objective test, and 44.7% achieved 45 or better on the essay test.

Minimum Passing Scores for EPT exemption

Objective Part:	35
Essay Part:	12 (out of a possible 24 points; equivalent to 39 on the CLEP scale). Twenty-three additional students with essay scores of 15 or above but with objective scores below 35 also qualified for EPT exemption.

Means and Standard Deviations

Objective Part Mean:	44.180
Standard Deviation:	8.879
Essay Part (Raw) Mean:	13.219
Standard Deviation:	2.816
Essay Part (Converted) Mean:	42.896
Standard Deviation:	8.218
Combined Score Mean:	87.076
Standard Deviation:	15.141

Statistical Data

Correlation between CSUC Essay and CLEP Objective Tests:	.57

Reliability

CLEP Test:	.88
Essay Test:	.785 $\pm$ .105
Composite Score:	.895 $\pm$ .035

Essay Reading

Number of Readers:	46
Number of Colleges Represented:	All 19 CSUC campuses
Grading Scale:	6 point
Number of Readings per test:	4 (2 independent readings for each question; additional readings to reconcile discrepant grades)
Total Essay Readings:	Approximately 17,500
Weighting and Scaling:	The essay score was converted by the equipercentile method to the CLEP scale (20-80), and the scores on both parts of the examination were added. Each part received equal weight.

COMPOSITE

ENGLISH EQUIVALENCY EXAMINATION SCORING DATA
1973-1981

	1973	1974	1975	1976	1977	1978	1979	1980	1981
Minimum Passing Scores									
Objective Part	45	45	45	45	45	45	45	45	43
Essay Part: Raw score on 0-24 scale (Scaled score on 20-80 scale)	13(48)	13(53)	13(46)	13(48)	14(43)	14(48)	14(45)	15(48)	14(45)
Combined Score	100	105	99	101	92	97	94	97	92
Mean and Standard Deviation									
Objective Part									
Mean	47.448	49.444	47.180	48.995	47.050	47.831	45.807	45.486	44.180
Standard Deviation	8.854	9.001	9.069	9.425	9.119	9.246	9.052	9.508	8.879
Essay Part									
Mean	47.916	48.620	45.291	49.447	44.804	46.979	43.790	43.041	42.896
Standard Deviation	8.402	9.171	8.693	9.107	8.753	9.194	8.520	9.435	8.218
Combined Score									
Mean	95.363	98.064	92.474	98.442	91.854	94.810	89.597	88.527	87.076
Standard Deviation	14.869	15.855	15.402	16.456	15.616	16.424	15.659	16.755	15.141
Statistical Data									
Correlation Between CSUC Essay and CLEP Objective Tests	.4777	.5225	.5037	.5768	.53	.58	.59	.56	.57
Reliability									
CLEP Test	.88	.88	.88	.88	.88	.88	.88	.88	.88
Essay Test	.72±.18	.68±.15	.69±.14	.87±.04	.70±.11	.745±.125	.745±.155	.765±.115	.785±.105
Composite Score	.88±.05	.85±.05	.86±.04	.87±.04	.865±.035	.88±.04	.885±.045	.885±.035	.895±.035

ADMINISTRATION OF THE TEST PROGRAM

Once again, Dr. Edward M. White, California State College, San Bernardino, served as director of the test program. Associate Director was Dr. Rex Burbank, San Jose State University. Coordination of test administration took place through the test office of California State Polytechnic University, Pomona, under the direction of Dr. Robert Bradley. A new test manual was prepared by Betsy Barlow of the Educational Testing Service in Princeton, New Jersey, and the administration of the test went smoothly.

No changes were made in the existing statistical or computer operation, which allowed the pass and no pass letters to be ready for mailing to all students who took the examination within 24 hours of the end of the essay grading process. A second computer operation took place under the supervision of Dr. Bradley to allow for a second-level pass, for those students not receiving credit but performing well enough to merit exemption from the English Placement Test. (See Comparison and Contrast, 1977, Appendix C, for a discussion of the relationship between the EEE and the EPT.)

In 1980 and 1981, the same procedures that had been used in recent years to develop the essay test questions were again adopted. The advances in essay test development that were begun in 1975 were an important contribution to the field of essay testing, and we discovered once again that the time, effort, and money that were put into the creation of each essay question led to questions that were suitable for their purpose and that could be scored with accuracy. A committee based on northern California was under the leadership of Professor Rex Burbank, San Jose State University. The other in the southern part of the state was under the direction of Professor Eileen Lothamer, California State University, Long Beach. Working with each committee chair were three faculty from three different CSU campuses. Thus, representatives of eight different campuses were involved in developing and pre-testing the essay questions. These committees developed essay questions during the course of the fall term and assigned them to freshmen composition sections on their own campuses for pre-testing.

Following pre-testing, grading sessions were held by the committees; careful assessment of scoring reliability and grade distributions for each proposed question then took place. Both questions were then revised and once again pre-tested. By the time the essay questions were ready for

printing, the committees were confident that the questions would accurately reflect student writing skill and that these questions contained no ambiguities or other problems that would lead to difficulty in grading. Results of the grading session in June demonstrated the value of the essay test development procedure. Once again, the questions worked very well, most particularly in allowing excellent students to show how well they could perform without distractions or ambiguities in the questions.

Nonetheless, a review discussion with the leaders of the reading revealed some dissatisfaction with the questions in 1980; in 1981, an additional step was added as a result of this discussion. Following committee development of the question, further review and pretesting were conducted by the other committee; thus each of the two development committees had (and used) the opportunity to revise the other committee's work. This new procedure worked well and will be continued. One important conclusion from this procedure is that any large-scale testing program must be prepared to spend both time and money on development of essay test questions. No matter how excellent a question may appear to be to a group of English professors, it may only be considered to be a good essay question after it has been pretested on real students and the resulting essays have been read carefully by trained readers. The readers can then judge whether a full and accurate range of scores is being elicited by that question and whether reliable scoring of the essays is possible. Certainly the essay test development and the essay scoring procedure for the English Equivalency Examination have developed into a highly reliable form of testing with important implications not only for testing but for the development of writing assignments in general. It has become clear to many of the teachers involved in the program that some essay assignments given to students in classroom situations lack the clarity, specificity, and ease of scoring that the English Equivalency Examination essay questions possess.

Finally, the California State University English Council continues to maintain close professional supervision over the entire test program. English Council committees evaluate the aims and procedures of the program and continue to support the test program by votes affirming the recommendation of these committees. (See Comparison and Contrast, 1975, p. 12 and 1978 Appendix C.) An additional sign of Council concern and sponsorship occurred at the fall 1979 meeting, where, after much

debate, a new committee was set up to review the EEE, with particular regard to the 1979 freshman English curricula at the various CSU campuses. That committee, under the chairmanship of Professor Dan Buerger, San Jose, met regularly 1979-81, and prepared a report to the Council (reprinted below as Appendix B). The Council has suggested that campus English Departments use the fact that they sponsor the test to "improve relationships and communication between our departments and the high schools." At the fall, 1981, English Council meeting, a new committee on credit by examination was appointed by council president Charles May (Long Beach). This committee, also chaired by Dan Buerger, has five other members: Richard Day, Humboldt; Gale Larson, Northridge; James Kormier, Sonoma; Edward White, San Bernardino; Carol Holder, Pomona. That committee is charged with review of all issues regarding credit by examination in English, including the EEE, Advanced Placement Program policy, and campus policies in the California State University system. This continued activity by the English Council is an important resource and strength to the EEE. Only through continued participation by the English Council will the test continue to have the confidence of the English faculties throughout the system and continue to deserve that confidence.

III

THE ESSAY TEST

The essay portion of the English Equivalency Examination consists of two 45-minute writing tasks. Each of the assigned topics is designed to examine a different set of writing skills, through a different kind of topic. Students thus write on two separate questions in two different rhetorical modes. Since the total essay score combines the four scores given to the two essays, the test allows some compensation for students who may write very well in one mode but not as well in another. However, both modes of writing are frequent in college composition classes, and skill in both is normally expected.

The correlation between the two questions has, over the years, been about .4; this rather low correlation supports the assumption that the two questions are examining related but different skills.

The first question is in the expressive/analytic mode. It asks the student to describe something from his or her personal experience, and to speculate in some way upon the meaning of whatever is described. Each year, a committee develops a specific topic following this pattern. This question examines the student's ability to describe something in precise language, to organize that description in orderly sentences and paragraphs, and to use some abstract reasoning in relation to that description.

The second question is in the expository/analytic mode. It asks the student to read with care two passages on roughly the same topic, and to compare and contrast them. Each year, a committee develops a specific topic following this pattern. This question examines the student's ability to read with comprehension, to discer similarities and differences between complex quotations, and to develop an organized essay discussing coherently these similarities and differences.

The sections that follow describe the evolution of the questions that were used in 1980/1981, give the questions, the criteria used to score them, and, finally, sample papers at each discrete score level.

A. Question 1 (1980)

a. The following report was prepared by Dr. Eileen Lothamer, Question Leader for Question 1.

Summary Report on Question 1:

Question 1 for the 1980 English Equivalency Examination was designed and pre-tested by a committee of four state university English department faculty: Dan Mc Leod, San Diego; Agnes Yamada, Dominguez Hills; John White, Fullerton; Eileen Lothamer, Long Beach, chairman. Aware from past experience of the pre-test needs, the committee agreed to follow the previous year's pattern, bringing to the first meeting in October, 1979, copies of two questions each and the pre-test papers to be scored holistically. The concern with these eight classroom-tested questions was distribution of scores over the full range, accessibility of topic to students no matter what their cultural backgrounds, and sufficient interest and variety to assure reader response to a holistic scale. From those pre-tested questions, three likely prospects were chosen, refined further, and put through additional classroom testing.

At its next meeting in February, 1980, the committee scored all of the papers for each of the three questions and evaluated them in terms of the criteria listed above. The topic chosen by consensus seemed to provoke fullest response in the mode traditionally established for Question 1: expressive/analytic. A scoring guide was developed and twenty samples selected to demonstrate the range. To provide for a bit more playfulness, should the student so wish to respond, the tone of the question was lightened over last year's and the possibility of a hypothetical collection established.

To secure samples from the "live" (actual) test papers, the question leader, the evening before the statewide reading began, read through ten batches of thirty papers each, and some Question 2 responses as well, to confirm a rather dispiriting discovery--that many students had perhaps been ill-advised to take the EEE, had perhaps confused the EEE with the EPT, or were just ill-fated gamblers. From that sampling it seemed that more papers would earn 1/2/3 scores than had been the case in the last two years. Further, we were to be confronted by an awesome number of philatelists and numismatists, variously spelled, with a large number of stuffed animal collectors thrown in for good or bad measure. The most reassuring discovery was that the question did elicit concreteness. Even those hypothesizing a collection moved beyond generalizations to particulars and provided analytic "justification."

With a large number of novice readers in mind, the table leaders' morning meeting, June 14, 9:00 a.m., was devoted to consensus scoring of the samples, verification of the scoring guide, reading of live batches of papers, and agreement on training strategy. The afternoon session with the readers began at 1:30 p.m. with six obvious range-finder sample papers (1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6). These were discussed to reach room consensus. The table leaders then discussed a range of five papers to establish table rapport. Following a break, the readers began actual scoring, which continued until 5:30 p.m. On subsequent days, the readings were scheduled from 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., long and demanding days of attentive reading.

At the beginning of each morning or afternoon session, the question leader and the table leaders (Dan Buerger, San Jose; Larry Kramer, San Bernardino; and Ken Seib, Fresno) alternated room discussion with table coverage, working with xeroxed copies of samples and with live papers selected by the readers themselves to illustrate particular concerns; e.g., the clear 3 score paper, the clear 6 score paper, etc. The search for strong 5/6 score papers was encouraged throughout the reading to prevent the slump to the 3/4 level as fatigue set in. And, as with previous readings, our concern was fairness of scoring for the students and reader reliability.

To achieve that fairness, responses were scored by two readers and discrepancies of two or more points received a third reading by the question leader or table leaders. In addition, constant table leader checks of the readers were run and the question leader, in turn, checked the assessments of both table leader and reader to remind us all to hold to holistic scoring rather than analytic and to refer to the scoring guide. It was again a highly professional enterprise, with dedicated, conscientious faculty providing remarkably reliable scoring.

In an evaluation of the question and other aspects of the reading, some faculty noted that the question was perhaps overly simplistic, not calling for a high-level of analytic ability; others, however, stressed the responsiveness of the students (only two non-response papers out of 4900+); others commended it as an effective warm-up for the first of the two writing tasks required for the EEE. Encouraged to try a more demanding mode for next year, the question leader agreed with the table leaders that the English Council should solicit specific recommendations before its Fall, 1980 meeting.

Although samples of score 1 through score 6 papers follow, they in no way represent the many and varied responses. We chose two at the 5 and 6 level which would not lead the prospective test candidate to assume that readers expected sublimity, sophistication, or polished prose. If students read the question and scoring guide carefully, they might be able to try a timed simulation and then evaluate themselves against the guide rather than against the samples as models.

Students, faculty, general readers of these samples need to remember what the faculty raters at Kellogg-West reminded themselves of frequently--the students had only forty-five minutes to write an impromptu essay. We now offer you a "collection" of student collections.

b. Question 1. The following question was distributed to all students.

You have 45 minutes to write on the following topic:

The Rockefellers and the Guggenheims with their millions may collect art and even artists, but the average American is also an avid collector. Photographs, stamps, comic books, stuffed animals, cookbooks, snakes -- you name it and somebody will collect it.

If you are already a collector, what do you collect? Why? If you would like to be a collector and had the money, what would you collect? Why?

WRITING ASSIGNMENT:

Describe the collection.

Explain its appeal to you.

Comment on its possible "value" and interest for others.

c. The following directions for scoring were distributed to all readers engaged in the grading of Question 1.

The student should be rewarded for what he does well in response to the question. Here the student is set a threefold task: to describe a real or hypothetical collection, to explain the appeal of such a collection, and to comment on its possible value and interest for others.

Note that the question calls for description and explanation. However, in some papers the description and explanation may be treated together.

An extremely well-written response may be scored a point higher than it would be scored on the basis of content alone. A poorly-written response may be scored a point lower.

POSSIBLE SCORES

6 A superior response will address itself to all aspects of the question. Though it may have occasional faults, it will be well-organized, detailed, and generally well-written.

5-4 These scores will be useful for a well-handled paper which is weak in some aspects of the superior response; e.g., it may slight one of the parts of the question; it may not be as clearly organized as a superior paper; it may have some minor grammatical inconsistencies. Otherwise, the paper should be competently written. Remember that a four is an upper-half paper.

3 This score should be useful for the following papers:

-- those which are only descriptive;
-- those which are only explanations of choice;
-- those in which the language is overly clichéd;
-- those which are general and superficial.

2 This score should be used for papers which exhibit serious weaknesses in structure, syntax, diction, and/or development.

1 This score is to be used for papers which show very little understanding of the question or suggest incompetence in structure, syntax, and diction.

* Non-response papers or those which argue with or avoid the question should be given to the table leader.

d. The following student responses to Question 1 were sample papers used during the reading to illustrate the grades on the 6-point scale:

SCORE OF ONE

Poems are away of expressing ones intro feelings, what a person may be afraid to say out loud can be put into a poem.

Poems tell a lot about people, a person can read a poem I wrote and know how I was feeling at the time, without me saying a word. I can feel angur towards my boyfriend, but he would never know until he has read a poem I have wrote for him.

Poems can speak of beauty, sadness, funny things, rimming at times, and making no sense in form. A person that writes nothing but sad or angur poem usually feel sadness or angur with in them, the angur may not show when your around them, but it's there in the poem.

I like to share my poems, the good ones as well as the bad, I also like to collect other peoples poems, because it lets me know that sometimes other people feel the same as I do, and I'm not alone, and if they can make it so can I.

SCORE OF TWO

Baseball cards go back about eighty years. Many of what are worth a great deal. Trying to collect these old cards is virtually impossible, due to the limited printing. Many of these old cards are worth thousands of dollars. If I had the money I would try to form the roster of all the teams ever to play in the major league.

Baseball and Mathematics are my two favorite subjects. Since Baseball cards are filled with percentages, Ive always had a interest in them. By piecing together the statistics from the teams I can conclud how good they was. The New York Yankees have always been a power house, you can tell this by there statistics. Also you can see that the 1922 Washington Senators had a terrible team. I don't believe many people would spend six thousand dollars for the roster of the 1922 Washington Senators, but I would if I had the money. This virtually and endless number of cards to collect, but I'd like to have one of every kind.

Baseball cards would also bring back memories to the elderly who lack at the teams that use to be. All the excitement they had cheering thier team on. The cars would show the young how much better some of the old unknown stars were better than these new Superstarts.

I don't collect Baseball cards, because it's to expensive. When I start something I like to finish it. So when I know I'll never be able to finish it, why start. If I had the money I would buy the cards and finish the collection.

SCORE OF THREE

Bottle collecting is a subject that interests very few people. The ocean, along the shoreline, is littered with the discarded remnants of the past. Diving in the coral reefs can yield many interesting shapes, colors and sizes.

The shape of the bottle gives evidence to its place in time. Methods of manufacture changed through the years and with them the shapes of the bottles. Edge and rim formation is particularly vital in establishing the date of manufacture.

Coloring, in some instances, can be important. Unfortunately, any bottle that has remained for any length of time in the ocean loses much of its coloring through ionization.

Bottles retrieved from the water must first be cleaned of the encrustaceans that have adhered to its sides. Many a diver has been surprised in this stage by a hermit crab or other creature inhabiting the bottle. Once cleaned, the bottles give a precise account of the people who sailed through the waters. Bottles can give insights not only in methods of manufacture but also in past life styles, and trade routes.

Bottle collecting besides giving one something nice to look at can be of value by adding to the historical record. True, not all bottles found could have this importance but certainly the older jars and apothecaries would lend information of value.

SCORE OF FOUR

Like the typical American, I too collect many things. Among these are stamps, coins, books, stuffed animals, dolls and photographs. All of which I enjoy termendously. My favorite collection, one which I can relate to the most, is my showcase of various shells and stones from the sea. They hold a very special meaning in my life and have enabled me to identify with the vast, mysterious sea.

I have been gathering and preserving shells and stones off the coasts of our nation for almost four years. My collection consists

of approximately two hundred types of ocean smooth rocks and pebbles and better than eight hundred different types of seashells. The stones and shells range from three centimeters to over one-third of a meter in diameter and can weigh as much as 75 pounds. They come in a varity of all shapes, styles and colours and no two are exactly alike.

I suppose people wonder, "Why does she collect dumb old rocks and shells?" Ever since I was a small child I have been strongly intrigued by the sea. The pounding of its hypnotizing waves, the smell of its stingy, salty air, and the happy feeling you get when it's wind teases and plays with your hair have always attracted me towards it. I feel that by collecting these so called, 'dumb old' rocks and shells I am forever near the place that fascinates me.

I would really enjoy to see others who feel the same way I do about the sea. My collection is just a mere fragment of its greatness, far from the real thing. By learning of the parts of the sea it could stimulate a person to venture farther into its mystery and cause them to learn more about its hidden value for mankind.

My collection is just a tiny bit of beauty that I will always cherish. It relaxes me while I'm doing the actual collecting and then 'comforts' me when I see them in their case at home. It brings me to the place which I can identify, even with all its unknowns, the sea.

SCORE OF FIVE

School, jobs, and friends take up much of a person's day. Sometime during that day, one must have some time to himself to unwind and relax. A hobby such as collecting can help one to do so. My own collecting venture, baseball cards, helps one to realize some financial gain, better enjoy the national pastime, and experience the triumph of completing a set.

Baseball cards were first issued by the Topps Bubble Gum Company back in 1951. I, myself, began collecting in 1970 and since then, I have amassed a stack of some 20,000 cards. All the cards are organized according to year, number, and quality. The majority of the cards come from the 1960's and 1970's due to the fact that 1950's cards are becoming increasingly hard to find. I have displayed the collection in a book-case in my bedroom and most visitors are awed by it.

At the age of eight, I came into my own as a baseball fan. That was also the year I brought home my first pack of cards. The pack crisply opened and the aroma of the pink gum filled the air. I shoved the whole piece in my mouth and looked at the cards. Each card was shiny new and had all the players' statistics, printed on the back. I was hooked. At that point in time, I was oblivious to the fact that

they were worth something monetarily. All I cared about was the fact I could impress my dad with the knowledge of Willie Mays' batting average. As I grew older, I contemplated the financial benefits and the possibility of completing some sets. As inflation soars, so do baseball cards. My 20,000 cards are valued at about $3,000. In 1977, seven years after my first 1970 pack of cards, I completed my 1970 set. During that time its value tripled.

Baseball card collecting is a growing hobby. This is due mainly to many rip-off artists in the hobby who purposefully jack up prices. To the serious collector, it can bring new friends with common interests. It is an inexpensive hobby, but it has its rewards in pride and accomplishment. I would be the first to urge others to join in on the fun.

What does one do with his free time? After the homework is done and the friends have left, sleeping may not always be the answer. An interest in collecting is growing in the United States to supplement this time. Baseball card collecting, besides giving one time to himself, can help one realize financial gain, better knowledge of baseball, and pride through the completion of a set.

SCORE OF SIX

Over the past five years, I have found myself participating in a most unusual and self-involving hobby--film collecting. While most people are content to collect objects such as coins, stamps and beer bottles, I have amassed an impressive collection of old movies, in Super 8, 8mm and 16mm, made during the silent and early sound era American filmmaking. The question of how I became involved in such a hobby is a difficult one to trace.

As an impressionable youth, I became enamored with the comic antics of such classic comedians as Laurel and Hardy, W.C. Fields and Abbott and Costello. Forsaking the televised lures of the spiritually and humorously unsatisfying comedy shows at the time, I strove for a more challenging and lasting form of entertainment. By the time I had realized the full seriousness of my involvement, I was storing money for the purpose of purchasing a movie projector, and films to screen on it. Branching from silent to sound, from 8mm to 16mm, I found that my influences were not left behind in that darkened room.

By watching those films, I developed a sense of what was and wasn't funny, as well as the general structures of making a movie. My tastes branched from comedy to other types of flim, and I found myself with the ability to judge, criticize and evaluate a work of cinema with the best of the critics. In learning about the films, my appetite continued to grow, and soon I was raping libraries for all the information I could acquire. And as my background in the subject grew, I found myself with one ultimate desire to produce my own motion picture. With several amateur efforts under my belt, I am now ready to pursue this career to the fullest.

Unlike many hobbies, this is one that is not lost on others. When a person, in the presence of a friend, begins to pull out his barbed wire or bottle cap collection, a token groan is expected from the latter. However, film is one subject that is accessible to all. Even if one is not familiar with the production background of a 1923 Snub Sollard comedy, he may roar with laughter at the scene in which Snub solves the gas problem by using a huge magnet to power himself by other cars. I have been more in demand from neighbors and friends since I have become interested in films.

The gist of the matter is that, for me, film collecting has become more than a hobby for me--it is almost a way of life. After all, how many stamp or coin collectors plan on careers working in a mint? Yet filmmaking is a lucrative business as well as a satisfying goal. And thus it may well be that my whole future and career may have been destined by a small collection I began half a decade ago.

B. Question 2 (1980)

a. The following report was prepared by Dr. Rex Burbank, Question Leader for Question 2.

Summary Report on Question 2:

Essay Question 2 for the 1980 English Equivalency Examination was developed by a faculty committee consisting of Professors Jack Conner, CSU Hayward; James Frey, CSU, Fresno; Hortense Thornton, Sacramento State; and me as chairman. All of us are members of the English Departments of our respective universities.

The committee met at San Jose State University three times during the 1979-80 school year. Our procedure followed much the same pattern as has been followed since 1975, that is, each member developed four essay topics. Of the total of sixteen topics, we selected four at our first meeting for pretesting. Each of us arranged for one topic to be pretested at his/her own campus, and at the second meeting the committee read the four sets of papers, which were written by students who had already completed or were then near completion of a second term of freshman English. From the four batches, we selected the one we felt was the most successful for our purposes. In making our selection, we evaluated the pretested topics in accordance with the following criteria:

1. Their capability of being scored holistically.
2. Their capability of being scored on a six-point scale, with a six as the highest and a one as the lowest scores.
3. Their capability of prompting responses from all the student examinees--could all high school students taking the test be reasonably and fairly expected to write on the topic?
4. Their capability of producing responses that had a structural arrangement (specifically, comparison and contrast) that could provide a foundation for group scoring.

Only one of the four topics seemed satisfactory, but even that one needed important revisions in the directions in order to clarify the assignment and focus attention upon the aspects of the passages that would enable the students to make the best use of their talents and training. At the third meeting we decided that the topic gave us what we wanted. We drafted a scoring guide and selected a dozen samples, which we reproduced immediately and which I took with me to the holistic reading at Kellogg-West in June.

As in previous years, Question 2 this year was designed to suggest an organizing principle upon which the candidate could write a 45-minute essay. It included two quotations, one a poem by Naomi Madgett and the other a quotation from an essay by Joseph Conrad. The assignment was to write an essay explaining each writer's attitude towards planning and striving and success, indicating the degree to which the poem illustrates what Conrad says about success and failure, and the extent to which Conrad's statement predicts the outcome of the situation in the poem. The structure therefore called for

analysis, comparison, and contrast. With such an organizational principal set forth by the assignment, the student was afforded a ready-made framework within which to develop his/her thoughts about the two passages. The scoring guide was constructed to enable readers to score all essays by the same qualitative standards and was designed as a brief, general description of the papers--from strongest to weakest--readers could expect; the samples illustrated the qualities specified for each of the six points of the scale in the scoring guide.

At nine a.m., Saturday, June 14, I met with the three table leaders assigned to Question 2. We went through the twenty-four samples and found that our scorings were substantially the same as the first ones assigned by the Test Development Committee. We were thus ready for the afternoon training session with the readers, who gathered at 1:00 p.m.

In the afternoon, the readers met with the table leaders and me and discussed the question, how it was developed, and the basis upon which it was to be scored. They read and scored samples of 1, 2, 4, 4, 5 and 6 papers, and I explained the rationale of the scoring and referred them to the scoring guide. They read and scored more samples and discussed them among themselves at the tables. At 3:00 p.m. I asked the table leaders if they felt their readers were ready to begin "live" readings; all three said yes, and so the reading began. At 4:00 p.m. three more samples were distributed and read, and the reading day ended at five-thirty with a review of the scoring standards.

All together 38 samples were used during the reading. In addition to the twenty-four we started with, we located fourteen more from among the papers being checked by the table leaders. These we had reproduced by the aides. We used fewer samples the second than the first day, and fewer the third than the second. Table leaders spent all their time checking the scores of readers at their tables. Readers were asked to adjust their scoring in accordance with the scores given the samples by the table leaders. In addition to sampling, table leaders read and scored the papers themselves, and recorded both their own and the readers' scores on a "check sheet." The table leaders, who read and scored the papers without looking at the scores assigned by the readers, brought the checklist with the test booklets to me, and I then read and scored them myself without looking at the scores given by the readers and table leaders. I was thus able to check continually the scoring of the readers and table leaders against my own. Where there were discrepancies, I could locate who was grading inaccurately and see that a correction was made; and where trends developed--such as a tendency to grade too high or too low or settle in the 3-4 range, the problem could be attacked immediately by further sampling and discussion of scoring standards. Using these methods, we achieved a high degree of agreement between first and second readers, and in about 95% of the cases the two readings produced scores that were within one point of each other. When a spread of two or more points occurred, the paper was read a third time, by one of the table leaders or by me. The number of papers with a spread of three points was very small, and those were radically uneven in quality, so that the discrepancies were understandable. I am satisfied that overall the papers were graded with a very high degree of uniformity, reliability and validity.

In scoring the essays we did not expect perfection from even the best student responses, but for a score of six we required that the paper show a high degree of skill in achieving what was asked in the assignment. The best demonstrated the student's ability to build on the implied organization with meaningful details, to develop the general points, and display a high degree of understanding of the quotations. Readers understood and took into account the fact that students were required to read two rather sophisticated passages and then to write meaningful commentaries on them in a matter of only 45 minutes--a demanding task; nevertheless, in order to be awarded the highest score, examinees were expected to demonstrate evidence of ability to perceive the complexities implicit in the quotations and to relate them in clear, standard written English.

Rex Burbank
San Jose State University
August, 1980

b. The following question was distributed to all students.

HER STORY

They gave me the wrong name, in the first place.
They named me Grace and waited for a light and agile dancer
But some trick of the genes mixed me up
And instead I turned out a big and black and burly.

In the second place, I fashioned the wrong dreams.
I wanted to dress like Juliet and act
Before applauding audiences on Broadway.
I learned more about Shakespeare than he knew about himself.
But of course, all that was impossible.
"Talent, yes," they would tell me,
"But an actress had to look the part."
So I ended up waiting on tables in Harlem
And hearing uncouth men yell at me:
"Hey, momma, you can cancel that hamburger
and come on up to 102."

In the third place, I tried the wrong solution.
The stuff I drank made me deathly sick
and someone called a doctor.
Next time I'll try a gun.

--Naomi Madgett

No one succeeds in everything he undertakes. In that sense we are all failures. The great point is not to fail in ordering and sustaining the effort of our life. In this matter pride is what leads us astray. It hurries us into situations from which we must come out damaged.

--Joseph Conrad

Assignment

Write an essay in which you show (1) to what extent each author believes that planning and striving assure success, (2) whether "Her Story" illustrates what Conrad says about success and failure, and (3) to what extent Conrad's statement predicts the outcome of "Her Story."

c. The following directions for scoring were distributed to all readers for Question 2.

The student is asked to write an essay that explains (1) to what extent each author believes that planning and striving assure success; (2) whether the poem illustrates what Conrad says about success and failure; and (3) to what extent Conrad's statement predicts the outcome of "Her Story." Papers should be scored for their overall quality, and the student should be rewarded for what she/he does well, but an essay that does not fulfill the three parts of the assignment should not ordinarily be given more than a 3.

An especially well-written essay may be scored a point higher than it would be scored on the basis of content alone. A poorly written paper may be scored a point lower.

SCORES

6 A superior response will be a well-organized essay that addresses the three parts of the assignment. It will accurately explain the view of each author--perceiving directly or implicitly the dramatic situation in the poem and its implications, and grasping the general meaning of the Conrad passage; show in what respects the poem illustrates what Conrad says about success and failure; and relate the extent to which Conrad's statement predicts the outcome of "Her Story." An essay receiving a score of 6 will display a high degree of competence generally but may have slight flaws in writing. A 6 essay will support generalizations with appropriate details.

5 Essays in this category will address all parts of the assignment, display good overall interpretations of the two passages, and clearly demonstrate competence, but they may be less fluent or thoroughly developed than the 6 papers, contain some inaccuracy in interpretation, or reveal minor grammatical errors or occasional awkwardness of expression.

4 Essays in this group will be generally well-written but may lack the development of the 6 and 5 papers; interpret one passage less accurately than the other; have some errors in sentence construction or diction, or lack the focus of the superior essays.

3 Essays in this group may show signs of clear writing but respond to only one or two parts of the assignment; contain misinterpretations of (or fail to interpret) both passages; radically misinterpret one passage; show evidence of serious deficiences in writing; or lack sufficient details to support generalizations.

2 Essays assigned a 2 may radically misinterpret both passages; reveal very serious faults in writing; display considerable irrelevance; be simplistic; merely express opinion.

1 Essays given a 1 show almost no understanding of the question or passages, and the writing shows incompetence in sentence construction, usage and idiom.

* Non-response papers and those completely off-topic should be given to the table leader.

d. The following student responses to Question 2 were sample papers used during the reading to illustrate the grades on the 6-point scale:

SCORE OF ONE

Planning and striving for success can assure success to a certain extent, but there is more to achieving it than preparation and effort. Each author believes success is possible but only if pride is taken into account realistically.

If the definition of success is not to fail, then pride must be the upper hand in order to succeed.

SCORE OF TWO

In the passage that Naomi Madgett is illustrating, Her Story, the person is projected herself to be something she is not. When a person has no identity about theirselves, this can cause failure in alot of endeavors. Joseph Conrad passage illustrates Naomi--Madgett illustration of Her Story. Joseph Conrad is saying to some extent we are all failures in some things we strive to do, but we should always substain a overcoming attitude about life. There will be trails and tribulation in one's life, but its the person who deals with these problems on a realistic point of view that will come out being more a success than a failure.

Conrad's statement predicts the outcome of "Her Story" very well, their are certain essential things a person needs to be a success in life, one is to know yourself and what you can do with your potential to the fullest and not to hurry into any unessary things which will limit you.

In "her story" she didn't know herself and she rush into things she had know business doing, she projected herself to be something she wasnt, this cause her to be lead astray.

SCORE OF THREE

In "Her Story," the author seems to take the stand that planning and striving for something does not always bring success. The author shows a young girl whose dream is to play the part of Juliet in a broadway play, but because of her appearance her dream can not be fulfilled. The author

seems to be using this character as an example of the many people in this world who, despite their great efforts, do not have their dreams and goals fulfilled.

Joseph Conrad seems to feel that everyone is a failure and that no one is assurred complete success. Conrad makes the point that, because of our pride, we sometimes get our selves into situations that can be damaging, not only to our working for a certain goal, but also to ourselves; "Her Story" is an example of this.

In "Her Story," the girl states, "Next time I'll try a gun." Thus, she showed the signs of rush decision that Conrad had mentioned. She was letting her pride get in the way of her self preservation.

I think if more people would take time to look over and examine the situations they get into, they would be more apt to realize when they were letting their pride get in the way of their better judgement.

SCORE OF FOUR

Naomi Madgett does not believe that planning and striving for a goal will assure success in that goal. Madgett shows in Her Story that although Grace learns all about Shakespeare and acting and has a lot of talent in acting she still does not become a success and ends up working as a waitress.

Joseph Conrad believes that no matter how hard someone plans and strives for something it will not always assure success because nobody can succeed in everything he or she tries. Madgett's Her Story illustrates what Conrad says because for Grace acting was one of those things that no matter how hard she tried she would never succeed in it.

Conrad's statement does predict the outcome of Her Story very closely. In Her Story Grace's pride is scattered because she cannot succeed in acting. As Conrad's statement says, she then hurries into a situation from which she can only be damaged. This situation was suicide.

All in all, Conrad's statement is a very true and accurate one. It suggests that once a person realizes that he can not succeed in everything he tries he will learn not to get to upset when he fails at something. By learning this he will not hurry into a situation which would later be regreted.

SCORE OF FIVE

In the first story, I don't think that the author made a point of, "striving for something insures success." I think the point was quite the contrary. "Her Story" is about a girl who tried so very hard and did not succeed. I almost get the feeling that Naomi Madgett has suffered an experience somewhat similar to "Her Story." It is very clear to me that

the author of "Her Story" believes that working very hard for something does not always bring success.

In the second story, the author is indicating that working too hard for something doesn't bring success. Joseph Conrads' point is to try and make the best of what we have instead of killing our selves for something we don't have. Conrads' point is similar to Madgetts' in that both believe working and striving for something don't always bring good resluts.

I think that "Her Story" definitely illustrates what Conrad says about success and failure. In her story the woman trys and trys and ends up "damaging" herself. The woman found she could not be an actress so she try to kill herself. She did not try to be happy with what she was. Grace should have made the decision as Conrad did, "no one succeeds in everything he undertakes." In that sense we are all failures.

Conrad hit the nail on the head when he said pride hurries us into situations that from which we must come out damaged. The woman in "Her Story" fell right into Conrads "Pride trap". She let her pride try to make her something she was not and thus came out damaged. I feel that Grace will not live to be very old, she will probably take her own life.

SCORE OF SIX

It is true that no one succeeds in everything, but an optimist would say that at least a person can succeed at something, and that "something" will diminish other failures. Naomi Madgett infers that planning and striving will not assure success, especially if he (or she) makes the wrong choices in life. In her poem, "I fashioned the wrong dreams" seems to show Grace's view of herself as a failure. No amount of striving and planning to be a great actress could turn her into a beautiful woman. She had to settle for a cheap waitress job in Harlem and her visions of success were crushed forever.

However, Joseph Conrad says "we are all failures" in some way. He infers that success is available to us, but we let pride "lead us astray"; in other words, we set our specific plans for life and define success by our narrow vision of life. We should instead live life to the fullest and keep on living, not desiring to end it all because we've failed in only one aspect of life.

The poem "Her Story" partly illustrates what Joseph Conrad is saying about success and failure. It is especially well illustrated by Grace's desire for suicide. She is saying in essence "I have totally failed. My pride will not let me go on living like this." This is what Conrad means in his last sentence "It (pride) hurries us into situations from which we must come out damaged."

However, Conrad also sees life as valuable, to be "ordered" and "sustained" even though we might fail. In "Her Story", Ms. Madgett doesn't say that life is valuable and worth sustaining even though a person fails.

A. Question 1 (1981)

a. The following report was prepared by Dr. Rex Burbank, Question Leader for Question 1.

Summary Report on Question 1:

Essay Question 1 for the 1981 English Equivalency Examination was developed by a faculty committee comprised of Professors Karen Hatch, CSU, Chico; William Robinson, San Francisco State University; Kenneth Seib, CSU, Fresno; and me as chairman. All of us are members of the English departments at our respective universities.

The committee met at San Jose State University three times during the 1980-81 school year. Our procedure followed much the same pattern as was followed by committees that had developed Question 2 since 1975, that is, each member developed four essay topics prior to the first meeting, and during the first meeting early in the fall the committee as a whole selected the four most promising ones of the sixteen for pretesting, one by each committee member at his/her home campus. In all cases, the topics chosen for pretesting required some revision by the committee in accordance with the criteria we have established over the years for essay topics, namely, that they:

1. Be such that all high school students taking the test can be reasonably and fairly expected to write on the topic and demonstrate their abilities;

2. Produce responses that can be read holistically on a six-point scale, six being the highest and one the lowest scores;

3. Generate essays with a built-in structural arrangement (specifically, analysis of a written passage, recounting of a personal experience related to that explained in the passage, and comparison and contrast of the student's experience with that described in the passage)--an important assist to the student, who is under pressures of time, and to the readers of the essays in framing scoring standards.

An additional factor in the 1981 Question 1 was the inclusion of a passage that required close reading and interpretation; previous years, Question 1 had been designed to elicit "expressive" responses only, that is,

relation of personal experiences or feelings about experiences. The 1981 version was intended to test reading skills learned in the first semester of freshman composition courses in most colleges and universities; thus the committee in the fall of 1980 wrote topics that included passages from essays of the sort found in freshman English textbooks used in first-term courses. The passages were selected to test specific reading abilities: to grasp main ideas; to make inferences; to understand tone and distinguish attitudes.

At our second meeting, each of us brought the pretest papers written at his/her campus; each of the four topics was written on by at least fifty students who were at or near the end of their first semester, or who had completed the first semester of freshman composition--Question 1 is directed at that level of achievement, as Question 2 addresses the standard of achievement reached by students who have completed or are nearing completion of the second term, wherein skills and materials of related but distinguishable types are given focus. From the four batches of papers--all of which we read and scored on the six-point scale--we chose two topics that we felt the most promising, making slight revisions in both the directions and the passages themselves in order to clarify the assignment and direct attention to the aspects of the passages that would enable the students to make the best use of their talents and training. At the third, and final, meeting we found that one topic stood above the other, which did not give us the spread on the six-point scale that we needed to have. We drafted a scoring guide and selected a dozen sample papers for the June reading, which we reproduced immediately and which I took with me to the holistic scoring session at Kellogg-West in June.

Question 1 was based upon a passage from an essay by Sharon Curtin about how we perceive the elderly. The passage consists of two paragraphs that deal with attitudes of a group of young mothers, their children, and some elderly people in a park. The assignment was to write an essay explaining each group's attitudes towards the others, telling of a specific experience the examinee has had with an elderly person, and explaining how the examinee's attitudes were similar to or different from those shown by the people in the park. The exercise therefore called for reading and interpretation, analytical writing, "expressive" writing, and comparison and contrast of attitudes in the passage and the writer's own attitudes. The scoring guide was constructed to

enable the faculty readers to score all the essays by the same qualitative standards; it was a brief description of the papers--from strongest to weakest--they could expect to see. The samples illustrated the qualities specified for each of the six points of the scale as set forth on the scoring guide.

At nine a.m., Saturday, June 13, I met with the three table leaders assigned to Question 1, Professors Alice Brekke, Kenneth Seib, and Jack Conner. We went through the twelve samples and found that our scorings were substantially the same as the first ones assigned by the Test Development Committee. We were thus ready for the afternoon training session with the readers, who gathered at 1:00 p.m.

In the afternoon, the readers met with the table leaders and me and discussed the question, how it was developed, and the basis upon which it was to be scored. They read and scored samples of 1, 2, 4, 4, 5 and 6 papers, and I explained the rationale of the scoring and referred them to the scoring guide. They read and scored more samples and discussed them among themselves at the tables. At 3:00 p.m. I asked the table leaders if they felt their readers were ready to begin "live" readings; all three said yes, and so the reading began. At 4:00 p.m. three more samples were distributed and read, and the reading day ended at five o'clock with a review of the scoring standards.

All together 28 samples were used during the reading. In addition to the twelve we started with, we located sixteen more from among the papers being checked by the table leaders. These we had xeroxed by the aides. We used fewer samples the second than the first day, and fewer the third than the second. Table leaders spent all their time checking the scores of readers at their table. Readers were asked to adjust their scoring in accordance with the scores given the samples by the table leaders. In addition to sampling, table leaders read and scored the papers themselves, and recorded both their own and the readers' scores on a "check sheet." The table leaders, who read and scored the papers without looking at the scores assigned by the readers, brought the checklist with the test booklets to me, and I then read and scored them myself without looking at the scores given by the readers and table leaders. I was thus able to check continually the scoring of the readers and table leaders against my own. Where there were discrepancies,

I could locate who was grading inaccurately and see that a correction was made; and where trends developed--such as a tendency to grade too high or too low or settle in the 3-4 range--the problem could be attacked immediately by further sampling and discussion of scoring standards. Using these methods, we achieved a high degree of agreement between first and second readers, and in about 95% of the cases the two readings produced scores that were within one point of each other. When a spread of two or more points occurred, the paper was read a third time, by one of the table leaders or by me. The number of papers with a spread of three points was very small, and those were radically uneven in quality, so that the discrepancies were understandable. I am satisfied that overall the papers were graded with a very high degree of uniformity, reliability and validity.

In scoring the essays we did not expect perfection from even the best student responses, but for a score of six we required that the paper show a high degree of skill in achieving what was asked in the assignment. The best demonstrated the student's ability to build on the implied organization with meaningful details, to develop the general points, and display a high degree of understanding of the quotations. Readers understood and took into account the fact that students were required to read a rather sophisticated passage and then to write a meaningful commentary in a matter of only 45 minutes--a demanding task; nevertheless, in order to be awarded the highest score, examinees were expected to demonstrate evidence of ability to perceive the complexities implicit in the quotation and to write in clear, standard English.

Rex Burbank
San Jose State University
August 1981

b. Question 1. The following question was distributed to all students.

Sitting in a small park across from a nursing home one day, I noticed that the young mothers and their children gathered on one side, and the old people from the home on the other. Whenever a youngster would run over to the "wrong" side, the old people would lean forward and smile. But before any communication would be established, the mother would come over, murmuring embarrassed apologies, and take her child back to the "young" side.

The mothers never looked at the old people who lined the other side of the park like so many pigeons perched on the benches. These well-dressed young matrons had a way of sliding their eyes over, around, through the old people; they never looked at them directly. The old people may as well have been invisible.

Assignment:

During the 45 minutes allotted to this exam, write an essay in which you:

a) explain what attitudes the people in the park have towards each other;

b) describe an experience you have had with an elderly person and explain how your attitudes are similar to or different from those exhibited in the park.

c. The following directions for scoring were distributed to all readers engaged in the grading of Question 1.

Students should be rewarded for what they do well in response to the question. They are given a three-fold task: to explain the attitudes of the people in the park towards each other; to tell of an experience with an elderly person; and to explain how their (the writers') attitudes are similar to or different from those shown in the park.

The question specifically calls for: (1) analysis of the attitudes, (2) a description of an experience, and

(3) an explanation of the writer's own attitudes. In some papers, the analysis and explanation may be largely implied, but the implication should be appropriate to the passage and the description. Some essays may say something about the attitudes implied by the children's actions, but most will focus upon the attitudes of the mothers and the old people, which are the important ones.

An especially well-written essay may be scored a point higher than it would be scored on the basis of content alone. A poorly-written response may be scored a point lower.

SCORES:

6 A superior response will address itself to all three parts of the question. Though the paper may have occasional faults, it will be well-organized, detailed, generally well-written, and accurate in interpretation of the passage.

5 The five essay will address itself to all three parts of the question; show a good grasp of the passage, but will be slightly weaker in content or detail, or in quality of writing than the superior paper.

4 This score will be assigned to papers that demonstrate overall competence and that fulfill the assignment but reveal somewhat less accuracy or fulness of interpretation, minor grammatical or mechanical inconsistencies, or some imbalance among responses to the three parts of the question.

3 This score applies to papers that:

have mainly narration;
are superficial or underdeveloped;
fail to deal with the attitudes of both the mothers and the old people;
show signs of grammatical or mechanical problems;
fail to describe a specific personal experience;
fail to explain the writer's own attitudes.

2 The 2 score is to be used for papers that show little understanding of the passage; suggest incompetence in structure, syntax, and/or diction; or fail to complete two or more parts of the assignment.

1 This score is to be used for papers which show little or no understanding of the question, the passage, or the assignment; or demonstrate incompetence in sentence construction, usage, and idiom.

* Non-response papers and those completely off-topic should be given to the table leader.

d. The following student responses to Question 1 were sample papers used during the reading to illustrate the grades on the 6-point scale:

SCORE OF ONE

My attitude is much different from the one the mother in the park exhibited.

I have great respect for the elderly and appreciate their company. I feel I can learn alot from their experiences they had in life.

The mothers attitude toward the elderly people was a frighten one. Frighten for her children because they are strangers, and because they are in a nursing home. Thinking that only sick people are in nursing homes the mother did not know what their intensions were.

SCORE OF TWO

Mildred Roll is one of the most dinamic seventy year old ladie's I've ever known. She moved to California five years ago. On the way out, her husband died. She established a whole new life here. She goes to my church. My mom introduced us. Since then we've been to plays, parks, and even a square dance. She likes me to call her Granny because her two grandchildren live in Boston, and she only sees them once a year, Millie lives in a retirment community for Presbyterian

missionaries. It's a really nice area only five blocks from my house. Most of the poople who live there have been out of the country a good part of their lives.

Millie was sick one time so my mom and I took her to a doctor. We found out she had cancer. People in a small coummunity find out things fast and pretty soon everyone knew. I went to see Millie a lot knowing she needed someone around. I noticed when people came over to see how she was, they would stay away from her. No one gave her the usual hug and kiss. They were afraid they'd catch it. I couldn't believe it. Her she was in her greatest time of need, and people acting as if she were a leppar.

People don't realize other's needs. They are more concerned for themselves and their posetions. I know that one can learn a lot from an older person. They've been through it all before.

SCORE OF THREE

The children are curious and are willing to talk to the old people. The old people seem anxious to mingle with the youngsters. The young mothers think the old people don't want the children around them. The mothers seem to think they'll never be on the "other" side.

Where I work there is this old lady, names Jean, who has an amputated leg. She is in a wheel chair. She wheels around the office yelling and complaining about everything that isn't done just right. She's a grouch toward everyone. For some reason she's never yelled or complained to me. She is very nice to me. She asks how I am, and how school is going. I tell her "fine" and how is she, she says, "couldn't be better."

The girls in the office are always coming out with their jokes about her. When I defend her they say, "Oh, she acts different with <u>you</u>."

I like Jean very much, and I show her the same courtesies she shows me. I'm not sure why she's a grouch. Maybe its her way of defending herself against getting hurt. I'd like to talk to her about it, but there's never the right time. Some people are afraid of her, they avoid her.

My attitudes are different than the mothers in the park, I was never reluctant to talk to Jean, or any other old person. I just smile, and usually the smile is returned.

SCORE OF FOUR

I think the attitudes expressed in this park are very common in every setting. In the first paragraph, it says the mothers would come over and apologize to the elder people. I guess society has given younger people the idea that since these people are old, they prefer peace and quiet so as to enjoy their fading years. To the contrary, older people like so much to be reminded of those days of their childhood. They also used to have tiny children running around in their house, and possibly miss the excitement and joy of watching a youngster grow up.

In the second paragraph an attitude of fear on the mothers' part is reflected. Because of the misconceptions life has introduced to them, they fear that some day they too will be among the aged, some thing which people would rather not think about.

His failing knees and hunched over back were the sign of his years. In his he stood a stout 6 feet, 3 inches, but now I was taller than him and I am five feet, eleven inches tall. Because of his bad knees he is unable to see a Dodgers game in person. He loves the Dodgers. On weekends he sits in his La-z-boy lounger and listens to the game with a transistor radio held to his ear, and watches it by way of a remote controller for his T.V.

One day he was visiting our house, but I couldn't stay with him because I had a baseball game. After the game was barely started, up drove my uncle to cheer me and my team mates to victory. He shouted at the umpires and ate popcorn, just like a youngster at his first baseball game. Through the joy and ferver for life that my eighty year old uncle projects, I see that they want to have fun just like the rest of us and they like to associate with younger people to keep them thinking young.

SCORE OF FIVE

These people occupying the benches on either side of the park have at least one thing in common. They all enjoy spending time at the park. But their feelings toward each other vary quite a bit.

The elderly people enjoy watching the youths play. It might even make them feel a little younger. They seemed to be reaching out everytime a small child was within reach. They longed for some communication outside of the nursing home in which they resided.

The young mothers' attitudes were much the opposite of the old people. They did not want to recognize the old people as being human beings. It's as if they were afraid of growing old and looking at the old people only reminded them of their fear.

For some strange reason people of a younger generation are afraid of people in an older generation. Whether this is because of stories told to them as children or phobias they incur at a later age, old people always have reputations as being mean and crotchety. The younger mothers are portraying perfect examples of this lack of communication between generations.

It's too bad people can not see people for what they are. If they could communicate they may find they have a lot in common.

Living in Claremont my whole life, I have had many experiences with old people, but none were similar to the ones exhibited in the park. I have met a lot of elderly people because Claremont is a city heavily populated with senior citizens. Most are interesting and usually I walk away with some helpful advise.

My mother brought me up in a different manner than the young mothers described in the story. She said old people were sometimes very lonely and it would be a kind gesture to talk to them.

Being a talkative youngster, I would walk up to just about any stranger and begin a conversation. After talking with a few senior citizens, I realized I could make them laugh and make them cheerful. This

made me feel very happy. I discovered as I grew up, stories they had told me about themselves were much like events that had happened to me. Their stories usually had a hidden moral that helped me ease through some childhood tragities.

One time I remember I ran over to an old man at the grocery store. He was picking out watermelons. Right off I knew I would like him. Afterall I loved watermelons. My mother begged me to come back and leave the poor man alone. He told my mom he didn't know how to pick out a good watermelon and would require some assistance from the "little one". He winked at my mom and my mom returned him with a warm smile. I told him if you knocked on a watermelon and it sounded kind of hollow it was a good ripe watermelon. We pounded on every one until we found a good one.

When my mom and I finally left the store, the checker told my mom he hadn't seen that man so happy in ten years.

SCORE OF SIX

The mothers feel nervous toward the old people. The old people represent spent lives and missed opportunities and the mothers don't feel comfortable when they see their children running toward them. The old people are symbols of impending death, senilities, loneliness, and unhappiness. The mothers don't want their children loitering about such things, almost as though they fear that a chance contact may deposit extra years on young shoulders, or a moment of eye contact might rob their offspring of happiness and well-being.

The old people feel a bit dismayed at this, and recognize it, for it is a familiar thing to them. The children are to the old people symbols of better days, before age palsied their minds and hands, and before they were betrayed and banished to the home by families that could not be bothered with an extra mouth to feed. The children are a link with the past, when they were young, strong, free, and their whole lives lay ahead of them. A time before they were shackled by the inexorable and unbreakable tendrils of Chronos. A chance to speak with them might offer a small chance of regaining past experiences.

But the mothers are stern reminders of reality, pulling that small chance away whenever it comes too near, reminding them that they are old.

When I was younger, about five years old, I used to run with a pack of about seven other five year olds. We would run about the neighborhood, making a lot of noise and occasionally getting into trouble.

There was one house that we always stopped by. A woman (she was probably in her sixties, but we just called her "old") and her husband lived there. We called the woman "Grandmother" and she used to give us candy and tell us stories. We all loved her.

One day when we went by, her husband gave us candy instead of the old woman. We asked, "Where's Grandma?" he told us that Grandma had gone away, and would never be coming back.

My family moved that year. Quite a while later, in junior high, I happened to sit next to a girl who had been a member of that pack. We began talking and the subject of Grandma arose.

She told me that she had found out that her uncle and been responsible for the old woman's death, as well as the torture killing of at least two other old women. As she told me, I could see that she was still affected by it.

I didn't see her anymore after that year. As far as I know, her uncle is still behind bars.

I'd like to think that my attitudes toward old people are different from those of the mothers in the park, but they aren't. I'm not so fearful that I ignore them, or would pull my children away from them. I can talk to them easily enough, but I feel uncomfortable and experience relief when either they or I go away.

I'm not quite sure why. Perhaps because I'm afraid of the time when I'll be old. They've lived long lives. They've had their joy and triumphs, happiness and sadness. They've reached some goals and fallen short of others.

All for what? They wrinkle and grow stiff in their age. They have to be more careful about what they do,

what they eat. Their bodies go to pot and often take their minds with them. Death is near, and they can do nothing about it.

Perhaps it is because they force me to face reality. We are nothing. We are racks of flesh and bone that move about and accomplish nothing of importance. Other racks of flesh and bone may feel that what I've done may be worth while, but they only fail to recognize their own insignificance.

B. Question 2 (1981)

a. The following report was prepared by Dr. Eileen Lothamer, Question Leader for Question 2.

Summary Report on Question 2:

Question 2 for the 1981 English Equivalency Examination was designed and pretested by a committee of four state university English department faculty: Harold Levitt, Pomona; John White, Fullerton; Agnes Yamada, Dominguez Hills; Eileen Lothamer, Long Beach, chairman. The committee met four times during the academic year to develop a question in the expository/analytic mode, one calling for the student's ability to read with comprehension and to discern similarities and differences between quotations. Committee tasks were established in August, prior to meetings. During the first meeting in early September, the committee reviewed ten topics which they had pretested in classrooms on their own campuses and scored before the meeting. In selecting two topics for further pretesting, we were concerned with providing clear passages for interpretation so that the tasks of comparing and contrasting could be handled by all students, regardless of their particular literary training. As in the past, pretesting showed that topics which seemed glorious to the test designers were not always so appealing to the students.

The topics which worked best had two passages of poetry, but we were concerned that poetry phobia might interfere with test performance. Fortunately, in this year's EEE design, topics from Question 2 were to be pretested also by Question 1 committee members, as were theirs by our committee. We therefore dispatched our topics to Rex Burbank's group for their scrutiny. In December we met to score and evaluate Question 1 topics which we had pretested. We worked to clarify writing directions for the topic we recommended for Question 1 and to suggest scoring guide concerns for their experience-based question.

Question 1 Committee members pretested our original topics and then pretested some modifications of them to shorten reading time of the poetry passages and to try substitute passages. At our February and March meetings, chaired by Agnes Yamada, the Question 2 committee reworked the topic to its present form, scored and assessed student pretest papers, refined the prose passage, and constructed a scoring guide. Twelve samples were selected for Kellogg-West training.

Despite some logistical problems with the topic exchanges between the two committees, we all agreed that such careful scrutiny was rewarding because student access to the topics was broadened and scoring ambiguities lessened. The exchange process, however, does multiply pretesting time and scoring, thus lengthening the design committees' involvement. The committees need to meet early in the academic year and plan to exchange topics by the end of October so that time remains for revision and further pretesting.

In June, equipped with samples from the pretesting, as question leader, I then read through ten batches of "live"--actual test papers, June 12, the Friday evening before the statewide reading began. It was clear from some three hundred papers that students could respond to the topic--though some glaring misinterpretations and historical inaccuracies appeared--and that readers would be able to assess the responses holistically. Wilfred Owen's poem offered clear, sharp detail and concepts; whereas, the Whitman excerpt, though brief and non-threatening, required close reading--an effective determiner for papers receiving 5 or 6 level scores. And, although students did not have to follow the sequence in the writing assignment directions, they clearly benefitted from the organizational pattern of comparison/contrast suggested. That evening I selected ten additional samples for Saturday morning.

On Saturday, June 13, I met with the table leaders (Barry Dalsant, Humboldt; Larry Kramer, San Bernardino; Agnes Yamada, Dominguez Hills). We scored nineteen of the possible training samples and selected ten for the afternoon training session. The first twelve samples were scored without the scoring guide so that the table leaders could check the inductive process by which the Design Committee had arrived at their suggested rubric. Following this, table leaders read through test booklets (batches of thirty each) to continue scoring guide checks.

In the afternoon, reader training began with seven samples for room discussion. The goal was to provide clear range-setting examples. But we also included two score 4 papers to focus on upper-half/lower-half distinctions. All seven samples were scored without reference to the rubric. But prior to room discussion, readers were asked to examine the rubric and refer to it during discussion. Room consensus was set and then reinforced with three papers used for table discussion (scores of 5,3,4). Following a brief break, specific instructions for marking booklets were given and the scoring of live batches began at 3:30.

At the beginning of each morning or afternoon session, the question leader and table leaders conferred on samples selected to reinforce the scoring guide and employment of the full range. We alternated between room and table discussion. A total of thirty xerox samples was used. In addition, table leaders selected "live" samples and circulated these test booklets for table consensus. We encouraged readers to look for strong 5 and 6 level papers to prevent the tendency to droop toward center scores of 3 and 4.

As with previous EEE administrations, responses were scored by two readers, and, where discrepancies of two or more points occurred, by a third reader. Throughout the reading, the table leaders worked constantly, checking scores from each reader's batch for reliability. After the first whole day's reading on Sunday, June 14, the table leaders and I agreed that readers were scoring with clear awareness of the guide and with concern for fairness to the students. This latter concern led to some gnashing of teeth when overly simplistic interpretations of the Whitman passage emerged, but our reminder was that students had only the passage at hand and could not be expected to supply a fuller context. Clear evidence of the excellence of the readers is apparent in the low discrepancy rate.

Given the closeness of the reading required and the 45-minute time pressure, we were pleased by the students' display of analytical skills in the 5/6 score papers. We may not want to teach Dulce et Decorum for awhile nor to read further in Specimen Days this summer, but we were often delighted by students' perceptions and amused by their misconceptions. To illustrate the range of papers, we have tried to select those which might help high school students preparing to take the examination understand that perfection is not expected. To achieve the highest scores, however, students would be well advised to read widely, to sharpen their analytical skills and to write, write, write.

Eileen Lothamer
June, 1981

b. Question 2. The following question was distributed to all students.

You have 45 minutes to write on the following question. Read the following selections:

Dulce et Decorum Est

Bent double, like old beggars under sacks,
Knock-kneed, coughing like hags, we cursed through sludge,
Till on the haunting flares we turned our backs,
And towards our distant rest began to trudge.
Men marched asleep. Many had lost their boots,
But limped on, blood-shod. All went lame, all blind;
Drunk with fatigue; deaf even to the hoots
Of gas-shells dropping softly behind.

Gas! Gas! Quick, boys!--an ecstasy of fumbling,
Fitting the clumsy helmets just in time,

But someone still was yelling out and stumbling
And flundering like a man in fire or lime.--
Dim through the misty panes and thick green light,
As under a green sea, I saw him drowning.

In all my dreams before my helpless sight
He plunges at me, guttering, choking, drowning.

If in some smothering dreams, you too could pace
Behind the wagon that we flung him in,
And watch the white eyes wilting in his face,
His hanging face, like a devil's sick of sin;
If you could hear, at every jolt, the blood
Come gargling from the froth-corrupted lungs,
Bitter as the cud
Of vile, incurable sores on innocent tongues,--
My friend, you would not tell with such high zest
To children ardent for some desperate glory,
The old Lie: Dulce et decorum est
Pro patria mori.* *(It is sweet and fitting to die for one's country.)

Wilfred Owen (1893-1918)

And so good-by to the war. I know not how it may have been to others; to me the main interest in the Civil War was in the rank and file of the armies, both sides, and in those suffering in the hospitals, and even the dead on the field. To me the points illustrating the personal character of the

two or three million American young and middle-aged men, North and South, embodied in those armies--and especially the one-third or one-fourth of their number, stricken by wounds or disease at some time in the course of the con test--were of more significance even than the political interests involved. So much of a race depends on how it faces death, and how it stands personal anguish and sickness.

from Specimen Davs
Walt Whitman (1819--1892)

Writing Assignment:

Write an essay in which you

- explain the views expressed in the two selections;
- discuss the ways in which the attitudes in the two selections are similar;
- discuss the ways in which they differ.

c. The following directions for scoring were distributed to all readers engaged in the grading of Question 2.

Students are asked to write essays that (1) explain the views expressed by Owen and Whitman; (2) discuss the ways in which the attitudes in the two selections are similar; and (3) discuss the ways in which they differ. Papers should be scored for their overall quality, and the students should be rewarded for what they do well, but essays that do not address the three parts of the assignment should not ordinarily be given more than a 3. Papers in which there is an oversimplification or a slighting of the Whitman passage will not ordinarily receive a 5 or 6.

An especially well-written essay may be scored a point higher than it would be scored on the basis of content alone. A poorly written paper may be scored a point lower.

SCORES:

6 A superior response will be a well-organized essay that addresses all three parts of the assignment. It will accurately explain each author's attitude and show how the two selections are similar and how they differ. An essay receiving a score of 6 will display a high degree of competence but may have minor flaws. A 6 essay will support generalizations with appropriate details.

5 Essays in this category will address all parts of the assignment, display good overall interpretations of both passages, and clearly demonstrate competence, but they may be less fluent or less thoroughly developed than the 6 papers, or may have minor grammatical errors or occasional awkwardness.

4 Essays in this group may lack the development of 5 and 6 papers, perceive similarities and differences less accurately, or have errors in sentence construction or dictation. Otherwise, the paper should be competently written. Remember that a 4 is an upper-half paper.

3 Essays in this category may respond to only one or two parts of the assignment; misinterpret one passage; show evidence of serious deficiencies in writing; lack sufficient details to support generalizations; be overly cliched or repetitious.

2 Essays assigned a 2 may be thin in content; exhibit serious weaknesses in structure, syntax, diction.

1 This score is to be used for papers which show very little understanding of the question or display incompetence in structure, syntax, and diction.

* Non-response papers or those which argue with or avoid the question should be given to the table leader.

d. The following student responses to Question 2 were sample papers used during the reading to illustrate the grades on the 6-point scale:

SCORE OF ONE

Characterized by their patriotism and courage, the men of war enters the life of bloodshed and death. The soldiers, young men consisting, experiences the trajedy of war. Killing their enemies, the bold, young, soldiers fear as they try to fight to keep alive. Watching the wounded die, and testing their mind ability, these warriors pursuit to their destiny and trys to eliminate the defense in their way. They fight for their country; showing of emotions when killing one another in the battlefield. Surroundings embodied with the dead, and possessing an erie atmosphere, the soldiers make the best of its home. The fighting exists off the field as men fight their way to stay alive and the families encourage each other their son is still alive. The war exterminate people, due to the argumental issues of two abnoxious leaders. The war: a trajedy within itself.

SCORE OF TWO

The subject of war is a perplexing one in which each individual has his own views. Some feel that war is a necessity for gaining power and putting down the agressor; while others like Walt Whitman and Wilfred Owen see war as a destructive force which takes many lives in its path.

For both Owen and Whitman the adage: Dulce Et decorum est Pro patria mori does not hold any water. Both feel that the significance of political interests in war does not weigh with the amount of men sacrificed for a war's final out come.

Both take on the belief that a man's life and well being are not worth putting in jeopardy when the risk is being taken for war.

For Whitman war is something the world could do without. People should focus on the losses occurring

during the war rather than the gains it will have achieved in the end.

Owens main contention is the ease in which people say "It is sweet and fitting, to die for one's country!" if they are not present before and after such an occurrence takes place.

SCORE OF THREE

The poem Dulce et Decorum Est by Wilfred Owen and the quote from Specimen Days by Walt Whitman express two similar attitudes about war but with different reasons. They both show the wickedness of war but one tells of the illusion of dieing of one's country, the other of the surrering of the wounded survivors.

Owen starts out telling of suffering, loyal soldiers who fight through thick and thin. They keep on going even with-out boots. When they die they are just annother of the numbers who die long, suffering, degrading, soldier-deaths. They have no glory or recognition. The just lay in the field making thier comrads sick from the stench. Owen is saying that it is a bad myth to belive, "It is sweet and fitting to die for one's country.

Whitman is saying the war is a personal struggle that lasts long after the war. It is an agonizing physical test of a persons mind in facing death as well as of the body over disease and infection. If the person dosn't die in field he is scard physcally and mentally for life. They are both saying that war is dehumanizing. It is not an honor to die for one's country. The suffering continues long after the war.

SCORE OF FOUR

The views expressed in these two selections are different in some respects and very similar in others.

The first selection emanates a real bitterness towards war. Owen describes in vivid detail the true tragedies of war and being a soldier. The killing, pain, suffering are the only aspects that he concentrates on. Owen also makes a point of undermining the patriotic saying, "It is sweet and fitting to die for one's country." Owen shows through this selection just how bitter and unfitting it is to die for one's country.

The second selection is a view of war that is more removed, less personal. Whitman describes his idea of war from almost a detached point of view. He describes what is interesting about war and what is tragic, both very unemotionally. Whitman expresses his ideas with a feeling of hopefulness which is absent from the first selection.

In both selections the authors are are very much opposed to the senseless killing and suffering that goes on during a war. Owen deals with the death as one of the dying. In his selection you are forced to see the tragedy as it occurs again on paper. Whitman, agrees with the uselessness of it all and describes it as a pained observer, viewing the destruction from the outside. Both hate war for its inevitable outcome of pain and suffering.

Whitman in his selection is merely commenting on war and giving his ideas and his interests on the subject. Owen, on the other hand, is bitterly opposed to war and is condemning anyone who advocates it.

Both men seem to be disturbed by the tragic casualties of war, one, however, seems to have lived through the hell he writes of. I hope many will read his selection and maybe think twice before becoming involved in another war.

SCORE OF FIVE

The two selections, Dulce et Decorum Est by Wilfred Owen and the excerpt from Specimen Days by Walt Whitman are both views of war seen through the death and suffering of soldiers. Wilfred Owen's poem expresses the view that it is not a honor to die for one's country. Instead, it is a horrible, wretched sight to view the destruction of one's fellow man. There is no honor in senseless death, or any death for that matter. The torturous account of one man's last moments exemplify this lack of dignity. Whitman's short dissertation reveals death from a different viewpoint. He saw the Civil War as a noble experience, since those that died faced this anguish and suffering with dignity and honor. As horrid as war may be, it is the personal character, dignity and honor of accepting the pain that exemplifies the spirit of a nation.

From these two selections, one may discover a number of similarities. Of course, both are a discussion of war. Ultimately both writers recognize the utter futility of war; the senseless and destruction caused by political differences, which, in the shadow of death, seem so very trivial. Yet, this is where the similarities end.

The differences between the two views are more outstanding. Obviously, Owen is writing about the first World War, Whitman is discussing the Civil War. These two wars were quite different in terms of logistics and technology. More importantly is the apparent difference in the philosophy of war. Whitman seems to feel that death with dignity and honor is exemplary of one's culture. The character of a nation is revealed in the manner in which one receives death. Conversely, Owen seems to feel it is a falacy to espouse as one's greatest honor: death in service to one's country. He apparently concludes that the utter horror and anguish of death transcends any possible justification for war's destruction. It is quite interesting even thought provoking to examine the philosophies of these two authors. Their similiarities and their differences may provide an insight into the utter futility of war.

SCORE OF SIX

In his poem, Dulce et Decorum Est, Wilfred Owen gives us a vivid and visceral account of the horror of war. His intent was to de-glorify, to undo the myth of war as something grand and wonderful through the gristy memory of one who had seen war's reality. He is saying that if those who create war as well as promote its image as something glorious were to see first hand the death, pain and fear, they would not so easily mouth the old lie: that it is sweet and fitting to die for one's country.

Whitman has allowed himself the luxury of stepping back a few paces, perhaps to a hilltop, to observe the vast panoply of the Civil War as a whole. Although he shares Owens' concern for the foot soldier, the little guy, he seems more interested in the character of the "race" he is observing. (I think he is really talking about the nation.) How will this nation/race fare in the face of this carnage? How will it affect the nation's character? He makes the point that the marks of war on each man involved will have a more lasting effect than the political outcome.

The difference between the two selections is one of perspective then: Owens is staring into the contorted face of one man dying from mustard gas, while Whitman is detached, observant, not unsympathetic, but almost the scientist or historian, looking to the future, without a blanket condemnation of war.

The difference in the manner in which the American Civil War and the First World War were fought is exposed, perhaps, in their attitudes. The Civil War was conventional, fought in much the same manner as wars for the preceeding hundred years. The First World War, with its mechanization, its airplanes, bombs, machine guns, and most importantly its deadly gases, was an escalation of the horrors of war unprecedented in the history of mankind. (Indeed, it would not be surpassed until Hiroshima.)

Owens could not afford to be dispassionate and historical in light of what was and must have seemed to be unprecedented barbarism.

TABLE/READER CHART

ENGLISH EQUIVALENCY EXAMINATION

ESSAY READING - JUNE, 1980

Chief Reader: #007 Edward M. White, CSC, San Bernardino

QUESTION 1

#01 Eileen Lothamer, CSU Long Beach
Question Leader

TABLE 1

#10 Larry Kramer, Table Leader
CSC, San Bernardino
11 Carol Megibow
CSU, Chico
12 Shelby Steele
San Jose State
13 Richard Blakeslee
CSU, Northridge
14 Harry Brand
CSU, Los Angeles
15 Jean Pickering
CSU, Fresno
16 Joseph Axelrod
CSU, San Francisco
17 Andy Moss
Cal Poly, Pomona

TABLE 2

20 Dan Buerger, Table Leader
San Jose State
21 Helene Koon
CSC, San Bernardino
22 Bob Noreen
CSU, Northridge
23 Paulino Lim
CSU, Long Beach
24 Jon Price
CSU, Sacramento
25 Peter Neumeyer
San Diego State
26 Gil Prince
CSU, Chico
27 Carol Holder
Cal Poly, Pomona

QUESTION 2

#02 Rex Burbank, San Jose State
Question Leader

TABLE 4

#40 Alice Brekke, Table Leader
CSU, Long Beach
41 Alan Sandy
Sonoma State
42 Sol Iyasere
CSC, Bakersfield
43 Dick Day
Humboldt State
44 Marvin Klotz
CSU, Northridge
45 Lennis Dunlap
CSU, Chico
46 Katherine Carter
CSU, Los Angeles
47 Barbara Quevedo
CSU, Stanislaus

TABLE 5

50 David Rankin, Table Leader
CSU, Dominguez Hills
51 Don Green
CSC, Bakersfield
52 Ed Borowiec
CSU, Long Beach
53 Hortense Thornton
Sacramento State
54 Charles May
CSU, Long Beach
55 Manfred Wolf
CSU, San Francisco
56 Margaret Doane
CSC, San Bernardino
57 Peter Brier
CSU, Los Angeles

QUESTION 1

#01 Eileen Lothamer, CSU Long Beach
Question Leader

TABLE 3

30 Ken Seib, Table Leader
CSU, Fresno
31 Harold Levitt
Cal Poly, Pomona
32 Agnes Yamada
CSU, Dominguez Hills
33 Keith Neilson
CSU, Fullerton
34 George Grant
San Jose State
35 John Cleman
CSU, Los Angeles
36 Dan McLeod
San Diego State

QUESTION 2

#02 Rex Burbank, San Jose State
Question leader

TABLE 6

60 Charles Moore, Table Leader
Sacramento State
61 Bonnie Neumann
San Diego State
62 Jack Conner
CSU, Hayward
63 Mike Holland
CSU, Fullerton
64 Ray McKnight
CSU, Fresno
65 Lillian Wilds
Cal Poly, Pomona
66 Loralee MacPike
CSC, San Bernardino

TABLE/READER CHART

ENGLISH EQUIVALENCY EXAMINATION
ESSAY READING - JUNE, 1981

Chief Reader: #007 Edward M. White, CSC, San Bernardino

QUESTION 1

01 Rex Burbank, Question Leader
San Jose State University

Table 1

10 Kenneth Seib (TL), CSU, Fresno
11 Michael Fuller, CSC, Stanislaus
12 Karen Hatch, CSU, Chico
13 Jack Haeger, San Jose State Univer.
14 Elaine Osio, CSU, Los Angeles
15 Warren Wedin, CSU, Northridge
16 Solomon Iyasere, CSC, Bakersfield
17 Susan Currier, Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo

Table 2

20 Jack Conner (TL), CSU, Hayward
21 Richard Hendrickson, Sonoma State
22 Joanne Lynn, CSU, Fullerton
23 William Robinson, San Francisco
24 Tony Arthur, C S U, Northridge
25 Marilyn Sutton, CSC Dominguez Hills
26 Hortense Thornton, CSU, Sacramento

Table 3

30 Alice Brekke (TL), CSU, Long Beach
31 David Boxer, Humboldt State
32 Judith Gottlieb, Sonoma State
33 Lennis Dunlap, CSU, Chico
34 Dan McLeod, San Diego State
35 Edward Borowiec, CSU, Long Beach
36 Mary Sisney, Cal Poly, Pomona

QUESTION 2

02 Eileen Lothamer, Question Leader
C S U, Long Beach

Table 4

40 Agnes Yamada (TL), CSC, Dominguez Hills
41 Joan Maxwell, CSU, Sacramento
42 Joseph Axelrod, San Francisco
43 Lola Johnson, CSC, Stanislaus
44 Jake Fuchs, CSU, Hayward
45 Gale Larson, CSU, Northridge
46 Peter Schroeder, CSC San Bernardino
47 Lillian Wilds, Cal Poly, Pomona

Table 5

50 Larry Kramer (TL), CSC, San Bernardino
51 Harold Levitt, Cal Poly, Pomona
52 Harry Brand, CSU, Los Angeles
53 Jim Kormier, Sonoma State College
54 Ruth Brown, San Diego State
55 Marion Robinson, San Jose State
56 Roger Chittick, CSU, Fresno

Table 6

60 Barry Dalsant (TL), Humboldt State
61 Audrey Peterson, CSU, Long Beach
62 John White, CSU, Fullerton
63 Carol Megibow, CSU, Chico
64 Donald Green, CSC, Bakersfield
65 James Frey, CSU, Fresno
66 Wilbert Crockett, San Jose State

STATISTICAL REPORT

February 1981

Robert Bradley[1]

I. The Test.

The eighth administration of the California State University English Equivalency Examination was conducted on Saturday, May 3, 1980.[2] The test has two ninety-minute sections; the first is an objective, multiple choice part, and the second is an essay part with two questions. The "Analysis and Interpretation of Literature" Subject Examination of the College-Level Examination Program (CLEP) was used as the objective part of the test. The two questions of the essay section were developed and scored by the English professors of the California State University and Colleges.

II. Scores.

1) Objective Score. The objective part of the test was scored by the Educational Testing Service, and scores were reported on the CLEP Subject Examination scale, which ranges from 20 to 80.

2) Essay Reading Scores. Each of the two essay questions was graded by two readers, and scores were given on a scale of 1 to 6. For a single reading of a question, a score of 4 or higher represented a passing performance. A zero indicated that the student did not attempt to answer the question.

3) Essay Question Score. The scores for the first and second readings of each question were combined to produce a question score, which ranged from 0 to 12.

4) Raw Essay Total Score. The two question scores were added to produce a raw essay total score. This score fell between the limits of 0 and 24.

5) Converted Essay Score. The raw essay total scores were transformed to the same scale as the objective scores to permit the addition of objective and essay scores in a meaningful way.

6) Composite Score. The objective score and the converted essay score for each person were added to produce a composite score. Inasmuch as both the objective and the converted essay scores are expressed on a 20 to 80 scale, the composite scores ranged from 40 to 160.

---

[1]I wish to thank Dr. John Bianchini, Head, Statistical Analysis Department, ETS Berkeley, for his contributions to prior editions of this report; I also wish to thank Jim Trowbridge, Assistant Test Officer at Cal Poly Pomona, for his assistance with the data analysis.

[2]See Cowell, W., The California State University English Equivalency Test, May, 1973. Statistical Report SR-74-10, Princeton, N. J.: Educational Testing Service, February 1974. See also Bradley, R. Statistical Report. In E. M. White, Comparison and Contrast 1979, Long Beach: Office of the Chancellor, the California State University and Colleges, 1979.

III. Candidate Groups and Norms Samples.

1) Total Group. The 4810 students who took both sections of the English Equivalency Examination comprised the total group. The objective part of the test was taken by 4845 students, of which number 35 failed to take the essay section.

2) Equating Sample. The equating sample consisted of the first 539 papers scored at the essay reading session. All of the essay books from the various test centers were systematically scrambled prior to the reading to insure that they would be read in an essentially random order. Inasmuch as the means and standard deviations of both groups were not significantly different, the equating sample was assumed to be representative of the total group.

	Objective Scores	
	Mean	S. D.
Total Group	45.49	9.51
Equating Sample	45.39	9.44

The data from the equating sample were used to equate (transform) the essay scores to the objective score scale. A sample was used instead of the total group so that computer processing and statistical analysis could be done as the reading session progressed.

3) CLEP Norms Sample. This group consisted of 541 college students who participated in the 1964 norming administration of the CLEP Analysis and Interpretation of Literature examination.

4) Texas Norms Sample. This sample consisted of the 188 students included in the 1970 validity study of the CLEP examination at the University of Texas. Scores on the CLEP test were correlated with final grades in relevant courses.

5) CSUC Norms Samples. The essay questions of the English Equivalency Examination were administered to three groups of California State University students. These essay papers, indistinguishable from regular papers, were interspersed with the candidate essays and scored during the reading session. The average essay scores for students who earned various letter grades in English composition courses were determined, and the information was used to help establish the minimum passing score for the essay part of the examination.

The three norms samples came from California State University, Sacramento; San Diego State University; and California State College, Bakersfield. The Bakersfield sample consisted of 71 students in English 110, a second quarter composition course which lists as prerequisites either a remedial course or certain test scores which grant exemption from the CSUC English Placement Test. The San Diego sample contained 62 students in English 200, a required second semester composition course which follows a required first semester course in report writing. The norms sample from Sacramento consisted of 75 students in English 1B, an elective second semester composition course taken primarily by humanities majors. For all the samples, the essay questions were administered to the students during the last several weeks of study designated for the course. The data from the three CSUC norms samples are summarized in Tables 2, 3, and 4.

IV. The Equating Procedure.

Scores which are expressed on different scales cannot be combined without giving a greater weight to the scores on the scale which has the largest range of numerical values. The raw essay total score scale extends from 0 to 24, whereas the objective score scale extends from 20 to 80. If scores from these different scales were combined, the objective score would influence the composite score about three times as much as would the raw essay score. A solution to this problem is found by transforming the units of one of the scales so they are numerically equivalent to those of the other scale. This transformation can be performed so that the "equated scale units" represent equal increments in relative position on each of the score scales. Inasmuch as the objective scores were reported on the CLEP scale, the essay scores were transformed to the CLEP scale by means of the equipercentile method of equating. In so doing, a given converted score represents the same percentile rank on both the essay score distribution and the objective score distribution. In other words, equal converted scores on the two parts of the English Equivalency Examination represent the same level of performance on each part.

V. Technical Notes on Equating.

1) In the strictest sense, the score transformation procedure was employed to establish scores that are comparable, rather than truly equivalent. The terms "equating" and "equivalent scores" are fully appropriate only when the two tests are parallel forms designed to measure the same psychological function. Because the objective and essay sections of the English Equivalency Examination do not measure the same psychological function (see section XI), the score transformation technique produces scores which are comparable but not equivalent. However, the mechanics of transformation are exactly the same for producing either comparable or equivalent scores, and the only difference is one of interpretation. For convenience, the term "equating" is used rather than a technically correct phrase, such as "establishing comparable scores."[3]

2) Two basic methods of equating are available, and when the score distributions are very similar in shape, these methods yield almost identical results. Given similar score distibutions, the linear method, which defines equivalent scores as those represented by equal standard-score deviates, is preferable. The linear method is completely analytical (determined by a mathematical relationship) and is free from judgments of curve smoothing. However, if the two score distributions differ in shape, the linear method fails to adjust for this difference.[4] Thus, when the distributions have different shapes, or when the shape of one or both distributions is not known or cannot be accurately predicted, the curvilinear or equipercentile method is to be preferred. If the two score distributions differ in shape, the equipercentile method will stretch or compress the score scale of the distribution being converted to fit the shape of the other distribution. This method defines equivalent scores as those scores which represent the same percentile rank on both distributions. Using the score conversion table (Table 1) for illustration, a raw essay score of 15 corresponds to a converted score of 48.

---

[3] Angoff, W. H. Scales, Norms, and Equivalent Scores. In R. L. Thorndike (Ed.), Educational Measurement, 2nd, ed., Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education, 1971, pp. 562-568; 590-597.

[4] ibid., p. 564.

The percent of students scoring below 15 on the raw essay scale is the same as the percent scoring below 48 on the objective scale. Thus, in the sense that the two scores represent the same relative rank (percentile) within their distributions, they are equivalent scores.

3) Percentile rank values for each point on the objective score scale were plotted on normal probability graph paper. These points were connected by a smoothed curve, and for the points on the curve corresponding to the percentile rank of each essay score the objective score equivalent was determined.[5]

4) If the two score distributions differ in shape, the use of the equipercentile equating method, as noted above, will modify the essay raw score scale by altering the relative distances of some scores from the median. This modification of the raw score scale will result in a less-than-perfect correlation between raw scores and converted scores. Another factor can also contribute to an imperfect correlation. The equating process is based on a sample of essay scores, but the conversion process is applied to the total population of essay scores. If the shape of the total essay distribution differs slightly from the shape of the sample essay distribution, additional discrepancy may result between the raw score distribution and the converted score distribution. The correlation between raw essay and converted essay scores for the 1980 English Equivalency Examination was .98. In prior years this value has usually been above .99, and these very high correlations indicate that the linear equating method could have been used without inducing serious differences between the percentile ranks of equal scores on the converted essay and the objective score scales.

VI. Passing Scores.

1) Standard Passing Scores. An examinee was required to achieve a certain score on both the essay and objective parts of the examination in order to pass. These passing scores were added to arrive at a minimum composite passing score. Data from the CLEP norms sample were used to establish the passing score for the objective part. Because the average CLEP score for C students in both of these samples was 49, a score of 49 was set as the passing requirement on the objective part.

For the essay part of the examination, a score of 4 represented acceptable performance for a given essay reading. The criteria by which a reader was to distinguish between acceptable (4 or higher) and unacceptable (3 or lower) performance were carefully delineated in training sessions prior to the reading. These criteria represented a consensus among leading State University English professors. Each essay paper had two questions which were given two readings each, for a total of four reading scores. A passing score of 16 (on the 0 to 24 essay total score scale) would thus represent an average score of 4 on each of the four readings. However, a passing score of 16 would not allow any consideration for error in the scoring process. On the other hand, an essay score of 14 would mean that, on the average, only two of the four scores were acceptable.

The data from the CSUC norms samples (Tables 2-4) were also evaluated in an attempt to set an appropriate and defensible passing score for the essay part of the examination. The basic premise was that the essay passing score should be

---

[5] ibid., pp. 516, 571.

at least as high as the average essay score of students who earned grades of C in freshman English in the CSUC norms samples. For the Sacramento norms sample the average grade of C students was 14.13; for the San Diego sample C students averaged 13.19; and for the Bakersfield sample C students averaged only 10.91. However, the Bakersfield sample is not representative of a typical second term freshman composition class, inasmuch as half of the students in the group had no prior college composition training, and the other half had taken a remedial course. In addition, spring quarter sections of English 110 at Bakersfield are typically attended by some students who are repeating the course and by others who have postponed the course because of perceived deficiencies in writing skill.

Given the prevalence of grade inflation and the fact that a C grade often represents marginal performance, it could reasonably be argued that the essay passing score should be at least as high as the average score of norms sample students who received a grade of C or higher (A+B+C). For the Sacramento sample this value was 15.23, and for the San Diego sample it was 14.53. As noted above, it is probably not appropriate to use the Bakersfield data for this kind of comparison. Thus a passing score of 15 represents a level of performance slightly lower than that achieved by "C or higher" students at Sacramento, and a half point higher than that achieved by "C or higher" students at San Diego.

A proposal to raise the standard essay passing score to 15 was very thoroughly debated at the score-setting meeting held at the completion of the essay reading. This meeting was attended by the chief reader, both question leaders, all but one table leader, the statistician and his assistant, the acting director of the ETS Berkeley office, and several observers. (At a prior meeting of question leaders and table leaders it had been determined that the readers believed Question 1 to be easier in 1980 than in 1979 (1979 mean = 3.46; 1980 mean = 3.61). This smaller group had also concluded that a score of 4 on Question 1 in 1980 represented essentially the same performance as a score of 3 in 1979.) Proposals to keep the standard essay passing score at 14, or to raise it to 16, were also carefully discussed. The final decision to set the passing score at 15 was based on two primary considerations: 1) substantial evidence (a lower mean objective score accompanied by a higher mean essay score) that the level of competence represented by a given essay was higher in 1979 than in 1980; 2) concern that some allowance should be made for reader error, and a score of 16 does not acknowledge this factor. Although the standard essay passing score was raised to 15, about 24% of the students who scored 14 were allowed to pass on the strength of a relatively high objective score (see the discussion of the compensation model below.)

2) Compensation Model. As in all prior years except 1977, a limited amount of compensation on essay and objective scores was permitted. That is, one of the scores could drop below the passing level if the other score was sufficiently high. Inasmuch as the standard objective passing score was set at 49, and that of the essay was set at 15, (which converted to 48), the composite passing score was set at 97 (49 + 48). The limits within which compensation would operate were then determined by defining scores for both parts which represented absolute minima, below which no compensation could be justified. The objective minimum was set at 45, because this score minimized the number of A, B, and C students who would fail and the number of D and F students who would pass in both the CLEP norms sample and the Texas norms sample.

The essay minimum score was set at 14, which means that at least two of the four reading scores were satisfactory. However, for a candidate to pass on the

strength of only two acceptable readings he or she had to achieve an objective score of 53 or higher, resulting in a composite score of at least 97. The limits of compensation, then, were as follows: essay scores of 14, which converted to 44, required an objective score of at least 53 with the resulting composite score of 97 or greater; objective scores of 45 through 48 called for an essay score of at least 16 (which converted to 52) in order to yield the required minimum composite score of 97.

VII. Placement Scores.

This year, following a procedure initiated in 1977, a middle score category called "pass for placement" was designated. Students who did not pass for credit but who scored above a lower set of criteria were granted a recommendation for placement in a standard English composition course, and were also exempted from the English Placement Test (EPT). Students whose scores failed to meet these lower criteria received no recommendation and were required to take the EPT.

A simple conjunctive model was used for the "pass for placement" criteria. That is, no compensation was permitted, and a student had to achieve a certain minimum on both parts of the test. In accordance with the decision to raise the standard essay passing score, the essay score required for placement was raised from 11 to 12 (36). A score of 12 can be represented by an average score of 3 on each of the four readings. The project directors concurred that a student who performs at this level probably has the competence necessary for minimally acceptable performance in a freshman composition class. The minimum objective score for placement was set at 35. This score represents a somewhat-better-than-chance performance on the multiple choice part of the test, and is indicative of at least minimal competence in reading interpretation.

In addition, all persons who received objective scores below 35 but whose essay scores were 15 (48) or higher were included in the "pass for placement" group. Such a relatively high performance on the essay would argue for the a student's readiness for a composition course, regardless of the low objective score. Thirty students were added to the placement group on this basis.

VIII. Pass Rates.

1) Objective, Essay, and Total Pass Rates. A total of 4810 students took both parts of the English Equivalency Examination. The 1417 students who passed the exam qualified to receive six semester units of credit in freshman English. The percentage of the total group which passed each part of the exam, using the basic pass criteria of 15 on the essay part and 49 on the objective part, is given in Table A. The percentage passing the total exam without compensation (requiring 15 on the essay and 49 on the objective part) and the percentage passing with compensation (as defined in section VI, 2, above) are also listed.

It is evident from the pass percentages on the separate parts that a score of 49 on the objective part and a score of 15 on the essay part represent pass criteria of almost equal difficulty. Accordingly, 39.4% of those students who passed the objective part failed the essay, and 38.9% of those students who passed the essay failed the objective part. Expressed as percentages of the total group, 14.7% passed the objective test and failed the essay, and 14.3% passed the essay but failed the objective part. By contrast, in 1979 8.9% passed the objective test but failed the essay, and 21.5% passed the essay but failed the objective

part. Prior to 1977, the pass criterion on the essay had been more rigorous than on the objective part, but in the years 1977-1979 the passing score on the objective part was relatively more difficult. Thus for the first time since the inception of the program, in 1980 the essay and objective pass criteria were extremely close--less than one percentile point apart. Because the part scores are reported on the same scale, this means in effect that the two parts of the test were given essentially equal weight.

TABLE A

	Objective Test		Essay		Total Exam			
					Without Compensation		With Compensation	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
PASS	1788	37.2	1772	36.8	1083	22.5	1417	29.5
NO PASS	3022	62.8	3038	63.2	3727	77.5	3393	70.5

2) The Effect of Compensation. The effect of the compensatory model was to raise the total pass rate from 22.5% to 29.5%. By scoring 16 or higher on the essay, 154 students with objective scores of 45 through 48 were permitted to pass. In addition, 180 students with essay scores of 14 but whose objective scores were 53 or higher were also allowed to pass.

IX. Technical Notes on Differences Among 1980, 1979, and 1978 Data.

1) Differences in Mean Objective Scores. The average objective score in 1980 (45.49) was .32 score points lower than in 1979 (45.81) and 2.34 points lower than in 1978 (47.83). These differences in mean scores apparently reflect two underlying factors: a) non-equivalence of test forms; b) decline in the ability of the candidate population. Two forms of the CLEP test are used; the forms are evidently not equal in terms of difficulty. The easier form is used in even years, and the more difficult form in odd years. Prior to 1978, there was a consistent variation of about two points in the mean score from year to year, and the mean scores for every other year exhibited only a very slight decline. This two-point year-to-year variation evidently reflected the difference in difficulty between the two forms, and the slight drop in mean scores every other year apparently reflected a small yearly decline in the ability level of the students taking the test. However, in 1978 the mean objective score dropped 1.17 points below the mean score (on the same form of the test) in 1976, and in 1979 the mean score dropped 1.24 points below the 1977 level. These relatively large declines, demonstrated on both forms of the test, undoubtedly reflect a measurable drop in the ability of the test candidates in 1978 and 1979. The fact that the 1980 mean score is 2.34 points lower than the 1978 mean score indicates that this apparent decline in candidate ability was nearly twice as great in 1980 as in each of the two prior years. Although the decline has not been large in an absolute sense, it has been a major factor in the rather sharp drop in the pass rate since 1978 (1978 = 41.3%; 1979 = 32.5%; 1980 = 29.5%). The factor of lower candidate ability was present in 1978, but its effect on the pass rate was masked because the easier form of the test was used. In 1979, however, the use of the more difficult form of the test combined with the effect of lower candidate

performance to produce a substantially lowered pass rate. In 1980, although the easier form of the test was used, the relatively large drop in candidate performance and the consequent decision to raise the essay passing score had the joint effect of producing a decline in the pass rate for the second year in a row.

Although the two forms of the CLEP test have been equated, converted scores on one form of the test evidently do not represent exactly the same level of performance as identical scores on the other form of the test. This inference is based on the likelihood that the two forms may differentially emphasize the measurement of several complex intellectual functions. Thus the conversion resulting from an equating study would not be totally independent of the individuals from whom the data were drawn, and its applicability to all student populations would be questionable. In other words, one form of the test could be easier than another for a particular population. It should be noted that this problem has been communicated to test development specialists at the Educational Testing Service. These specialists have given assurance that the apparent anomaly in the equating process will not recur in two new forms of the test which are currently being normed and equated. It is anticipated that these new forms of the CLEP test will be available for the 1982 English Equivalency Examination.

2) Changes in Converted Score Equivalents. For the 1980 data, converted score equivalents for essay scores were almost identical to those obtained in 1979. For example, in the critical pass/fail range, essay scores of 14, 15, and 16 converted to 45, 49, and 52 in 1979, whereas in 1980 the same essay scores converted to 44, 48, and 52. Typically, the difference in converted score equivalents at the middle of the scale ranges from two to eight points from one year to the next. These variations are caused by changes in the mean objective score or the mean essay score, or both. If the essay performance remains constant, a drop in objective scores results in lower converted score equivalents. Conversely, if the objective scores remain constant, a rise in essay scores produces an increase in converted score equivalents. In 1980 the sharp drop in candidate performance more than offset the score increase associated with the easier form of the test, and the mean objective score dropped very slightly (.32 points). A slight increase in the mean essay score compensated for the effect of the objective score decline, and thus the converted score equivalents were very close to those of 1979.

X. Correlations Between Readings and Between Questions.

The correlation between the scores for the first and second readings of Question 1 was .68, and for Question 2 was .70. These figures, when expanded by the Spearman-Brown formula, represent the reliability of the grading procedure, and are discussed in the section on reliability. The scores for the first reading of Question 1 correlated .42 with the scores for the first reading of Question 2, and the scores for the second reading of both questions correlated .40.

When the two reading scores for each question are combined, the correlation between the question scores is .48. This figure represents the degree of relationship between the two essay questions. Inasmuch as the proportion of shared variance is indicated by the square of the correlation, only 23% of the variance in each question was shared with the other. This suggests that the two questions drew upon essentially different types of writing ability. However, some of the underlying relationship between the two questions was obscured by the unreliability of the grading. An estimate of the true strength of this relationship can be obtained by removing the effect of the unreliability in the grading procedure. When the influence of grading unreliability is extracted from both questions by a procedure known as "correction for attenuation,"[6] the estimated relationship

[6]Magnusson, D., Test Theory, Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1967, pp. 147-149.

between the questions is .59. The correction for grading unreliability increases the proportion of shared variance to only 35%, which tends to confirm the inference that the two questions represented different domains of content, and sampled different facets of writing ability which are presumably developed in English Composition classes.

XI. Correlations Between Parts.

Correlations among the objective, raw essay total, and converted essay scores were computed for the total group. The objective and converted essay scores correlated .56, which is about optimal for an examination of this kind. If the relationship were much lower it would be difficult to justify the compensation which is allowed by combining the scores to form a composite. A substantially higher correlation would mean that each part overlapped the other to the extend that the use of both parts would be redundant.

The correlation of .98 between the raw and converted essay scores indicates a strong linear relationship between the scores. As noted above (section V, 4), this high degree of linearity means that the two score distributions are very similar in shape, and the linear equating method could have been used without producing serious distortion.

XII. Reliability.

1) Reliability of the Objective Part. The reliability of the CLEP "Analysis and Interpretation of Literature" examination is .88 as reported in the CLEP Score Interpretation Guide.

2) Reliability of the Essay Part. Because essay tests generally consist of only one or at most several items, it is not possible to compute reliability by split-half or internal consistency methods. The only alternative is "form-to-form" reliability, which entails giving two equivalent forms of a test to the same group of students. However, the preparation of an equivalent form for a one-or-two question test is not feasible, because one or two questions do not constitute an adequate sample from the domain of content. In lieu of a formal method of computing reliability, a method of estimation is available. Upper and lower limits of reliability can be established, with the certainty that the actual value lies somewhere between the two limits.

3) The Upper Limit. The correlation between grades on the first and second readings of each essay question represents the reliability of the grading procedure. Because unreliability due to grading is only one of several sources of error variance, the value for grading reliability will always be higher than the overall reliability value which includes all sources of error variance. Thus, grading reliability can be used as the upper limit of overall or actual reliability. For Question 1, the correlation between grades on both readings is .68, and for Question 2 the correlation is .70. These values are the reliabilities of a single reading. That is, the reliability of each reading of Question 1 is .68. Adding

---

[7] Score Interpretation Guide, College-Level Examination Program, Princeton: College Entrance Examination Board, 1967, p. 31.

the reading scores to obtain a question score produces an increase in reliability, which is estimated by the Spearman-Brown formula.[8] The estimated reliability for Question 1 is .81, and that for Question 2 is .82.

Because the essay total score is the sum of the question scores, the reading reliability for the total is higher than that for either of the questions. The reading reliability of the essay total score is most appropriately estimated by the formula for computing the reliability of a linear composite, inasmuch as the two questions (as established above) are not alternate forms representing the same domain of content.[9] The reading reliability of the essay total score is estimated to be .88, and this value is taken as the upper limit of reliability for the total essay test.

4) The Lower Limit. The obtained correlation between Question 1 and Question 2 is used to estimate the lower limit of reliability. If each question were treated as a one-question test, the actual reliability per question could be obtained by giving an equivalent form of a question and correlating scores on both forms. Unreliability due both to grading and to fluctuations in performance would be reflected in such a "form-to-form" coefficient. It has already been demonstrated that Question 1 and Question 2 are not equivalent in terms of content. To the extent that the two questions are not equivalent, the correlation between them will underestimate the actual reliability of the question scores.

The correlation between the scores on Question 1 and Question 2 is .48. Again, because the essay total score includes both questions, the reliability of the total will be higher, and is estimated by the linear composite method to be .65. The actual reliability of the essay test therefore lies between the lower limit of .65 and the upper limit of .88.

5) Reliability of the Composite Scores. The estimated reliability of the composite scores, based on reliability coefficients of .88 for the objective test and between .65 and .88 for the essay part, is between .85 and .92.

6) Discrepant Reading Scores. As noted in section II, each essay was read twice. And, as the scores for each reading ranged from 0 to 6, the discrepancy between the two reading scores could be as large as 5 points (scores of 0 and 6 could not be assigned to the same essay, because 0 represents no attempt). Before 1979, discrepancies of three or more points between reading scores were always resolved (reduced to two points or less) by a third reading. Two-point differences were allowed to stand, unless one reading was pass and the other was fail; that is, unless the scores were 5-3 or 4-2. In such cases, a third reading resolved the difference by taking the middle value for both scores or by assigning one of the values for both scores. In all cases involving a third reading, the third reader was not allowed to see the first two scores assigned.

In 1979 the project directors adopted a more restrictive policy regarding discrepant reading scores. In addition to the correction of all differences of three or more points, all differences of two points were resolved by a third reading (in contrast to correcting only two-point differences of 5-3 or 4-2). In

---

[8] Magnusson, op. cit., p. 74.

[9] Nunnally, J., Psychometric Theory, New York: McGraw-Hill, 1967, pp. 226-230.

effect, only one-point score discrepancies were allowed to stand. This new procedure has resulted in slightly higher reliability coefficients than were obtained prior to 1979.

7) Reliability in Terms of Reading Score Discrepancies. Another means of expressing the reliability of essay scores is to indicate the frequency and magnitude of the discrepancies between the two reading scores for each question. Inasmuch as each of the 4810 candidates wrote two essays and each essay was read twice, there were 4810 pairs of scores for each of the two questions. As noted above, since 1979 the policy has been to resolve all discrepancies of more than one point. Unfortunately, a small amount of error occurred in the discrepancy correction process, and 11 two-point discrepancies (out of 9620 score pairs) were not resolved.

For Question 1, 55.9% of the score pairs had no discrepancy. A discrepancy of one point occurred in 43.9% of the pairs, and a discrepancy of two points occurred (by error) in .1% of the cases. For Question 2, the figures were 53.8% for no difference, 46.1% for one-point differences, and .1% (by error) for two-point differences. In summary, for the total reading the two reading scores were either identical or differed by only one point in 99.89% of the cases, and two-point differences occurred inadvertently in .11% of the cases.

XIII. Validity.

1) Validity of the Objective Part. Course grades or other indicators of classroom achievement can be correlated with test scores to obtain measures of concurrent validity. The CLEP Score Interpretation Guide reports correlations between scores on the "Analysis and Interpretation of Literature" examination and course grades before and after the final examination: the values are .42 and .54, respectively. As noted in the CLEP Guide,[10] these correlations should be interpreted with caution because of lack of uniformity in the procedures by which the data were obtained.

2) Validity of the Essay Part. English composition grades earned by students in the CSUC norms samples were correlated with essay total scores. For the Bakersfield sample the essay/grade correlation was .51; for the San Diego sample the correlation was .29; and for the Sacramento sample the value was .40. Inasmuch as class grades may be affected by factors unrelated to competence, such as absences or incomplete assignments, the instructors were also asked to rank their students on a six-point scale of general ability in the course. It was anticipated that the ranks would more accurately reflect the students' abilities than would the course grades, resulting in higher correlations with the essay scores. However, as in all prior years, the data were not conclusive. The correlations of essay scores with ranks were as follows: Bakersfield, .50; San Diego, .47; and Sacramento, .42. Thus the essay/rank correlations were higher than the essay/grade correlations for the San Diego and Sacramento samples, but not for the Bakersfield sample. Such relatively small differences between correlations have no substantive meaning, particularly in view of the rather small number of cases involved. It should also be noted that all the values cited in this section reflect the unreliability in grading due to the various standards used by different instructors, and should be interpreted only as gross approximations, if not as underestimates, of concurrent validity.

---

[10] op. cit., pp. 33, 34.

TABLE 1

SCORE CONVERSION TABLE

May 1980

Essay Total Score	Converted Score
24	72
23	71
22	69
21	67
20	65
19	63
18	60
17	56
16	52
15	48
14	44
13	40
12	36
11	32
10	30
9	28
8	27
7	26
6	25
5	24
4	23
3	22
2	21
1	20
0	20

TABLE 2

1980 NORMS SAMPLE, BAKERSFIELD

English 110, Second Quarter

Grade	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Range
A	7	15.43	2.38	12-20
B	16	13.19	2.13	9-16
C	35	10.91	2.80	5-16
D	6	10.00	1.63	7-12
F	7	9.86	1.96	7-13
A+B	23	13.87	2.44	9-20
A+B+C	58	12.09	3.03	5-20
C+D	41	10.78	2.68	5-16
D+F	13	9.92	1.82	7-13
TOTAL	71	11.69	2.97	5-20

TABLE 3

1980 NORMS SAMPLE, SACRAMENTO

English 1B, Second Semester

Grade	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Range
A	13	17.23	3.02	11-23
B	31	15.48	2.34	11-23
C	31	14.13	2.47	10-21
A+B	44	16.00	2.68	11-23
TOTAL	75	15.23	2.75	10-23

TABLE 4

1980 NORMS SAMPLE, SAN DIEGO

English 200, Second Semester

Grade	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Range
A	13	15.15	3.37	10-21
B	31	14.97	2.89	7-20
C	16	13.19	2.38	8-17
D	2	11.50	1.50	10-13
A+B	44	15.02	3.04	7-21
A+B+C	60	14.53	2.99	7-21
C+D	18	13.00	2.36	8-17
TOTAL	62	14.44	3.00	7-21

STATISTICAL REPORT

February 1982

Robert Bradley[1]
Jim Trowbridge

I. The Test.

The ninth administration of the California State University English Equivalency Examination was conducted on Saturday, April 25, 1981.[2] The test has two ninety-minute sections; the first is an objective, multiple-choice part, and the second is an essay part with two questions. The "Analysis and Interpretation of Literature" Subject Examination of the College-Level Examination Program (CLEP) was used as the objective part of the test. The two questions of the essay section were developed and scored by the English professors of the California State University system.

II. Scores.

1) Objective Score. The objective part of the test was scored by the Educational Testing Service, and scores were reported on the CLEP Subject Examination scale, which ranges from 20 to 80.

2) Essay Reading Scores. Each of the two essay questions was graded by two readers, and scores were given on a scale of 1 to 6. For a single reading of a question, a score of 4 or higher represented a passing performance. A zero indicated that the student did not attempt to answer the question.

3) Essay Question Score. The scores for the first and second readings of each question were combined to produce a question score, which ranged from 0 to 12.

4) Raw Essay Total Score. The two questions scores were added to produce a raw essay total score. This score fell between the limits of 0 and 24.

5) Converted Essay Score. The raw essay total scores were transformed to the same scale as the objective scores to permit the addition of objective and essay scores in a meaningful way.

6) Composite Score. The objective score and the converted essay score for each person were added to produce a composite score. Inasmuch as both the objective and the converted essay scores are expressed on a 20 to 80 scale, the composite scores ranged from 40 to 160.

---

[1]The authors wish to thank Dr. John Bianchini, Head, Statistical Analysis Department, ETS Berkeley, for his contributions to prior editions of this report.

[2]See Cowell, W., The California State University English Equivalency Test, May, 1973. Statistical Report SR-74-10, Princeton, N. J.: Educational Testing Service, February 1974. See also Bradley, R. Statistical Report. In E. M. White, Comparison and Contrast 1980, Long Beach: Office of the Chancellor, The California State University and Colleges, 1980.

III. Candidate Groups and Norms Samples.

1) Total Group. The 4014 students who took both sections of the English Equivalency Examination comprised the total group. The objective part of the test was taken by 4036 students, of which number 22 failed to take the essay section.

2) Equating Sample. The equating sample consisted of the first 525 papers scored at the essay reading session. All of the essay books from the various test centers were systematically scrambled prior to the reading to insure that they would be read in an essentially random order. Inasmuch as the means and standard deviations of both groups were not significantly different, the equating sample was assumed to be representative of the total group.

TABLE 1

Objective Scores

	Mean	S. D.
Total Group	44.18	8.88
Equating Sample	43.85	8.66

The data from the equating sample were used to equate (transform) the essay scores to the objective score scale. A sample was used instead of the total group so that computer processing and statistical analysis could be done as the reading session progressed.

3) CLEP Norms Sample. This group consisted of 541 college students who participated in the 1964 norming administration of the CLEP Analysis and Interpretation of Literature examination.

4) Texas Norms Sample. This sample consisted of the 188 students included in the 1970 validity study of the CLEP examination at the University of Texas. Scores on the CLEP test were correlated with final grades in relevant courses.

5) CSUC Norms Samples. The essay questions of the English Equivalency Examination were administered to five groups of California State University students. These essay papers, indistinguishable from regular papers, were interspersed with the candidate essays and scored during the reading session. The average essay scores for students who earned various letter grades in English composition courses were determined, and the information was used to help establish the minimum passing score for the essay part of the examination.

The five norms samples for 1981 came from the following CSU campuses: Northridge, Hayward, Pomona, Fullerton, and Dominguez Hills. The Northridge sample consisted of 110 students, of whom 76 were enrolled in English 155 and 34 in English 255. English 155, Freshman Composition, is a 3-unit, one-semester course; English 255, Introduction to Literature, meets the university's Humanities requirement, and is also a 3-unit, one-semester course. The Hayward norms sample contained 62 students, of whom 27 were enrolled in English 203 and 35 in English 204. English 203 and 204, Introduction to Critical Writing, is an 8-unit, two-quarter sequence taken primarily by English and Liberal Studies majors. The Pomona sample consisted of 49 students in English 105, the second course in a two-quarter Freshman Composition sequence. English 105 is a 4-unit course with emphasis on exposition and argumentation. The Fullerton sample consisted of 43 students in English 101, Beginning College Writing, which is a 3-unit, one-semester course that meets the

university's English composition requirement. The smallest norms sample came from Dominguez Hills and contained 41 students in English 100, Oral and Written Expression. This 4-unit course is the first part of a two-quarter sequence which is required of all students and focuses mainly on composition. For all the samples, the essay questions were administered to the students during the last several weeks of study designated for each course. The data from the five CSU norms samples are summarized in Tables 5-9.

IV. The Equating Procedure.

Scores which are expressed on different scales cannot be combined without giving a greater weight to the scores on the scale which has the largest range of numerical values. The raw essay total score scale extends from 0 to 24, whereas the objective score scale extends from 20 to 80. If scores from these different scales were combined, the objective score would influence the composite score about three times as much as would the raw essay score. A solution to this problem is found by transforming the units of one of the scales so they are numerically equivalent to those of the other scale. This transformation can be performed so that the "equated scale units" represent equal increments in relative position on each of the score scales. Inasmuch as the objective scores were reported on the CLEP scale, the essay scores were transformed to the CLEP scale by means of the equipercentile method of equating. In so doing, a given converted score represents the same percentile rank on both the essay score distribution and the objective score distribution. In other words, equal converted scores on the two parts of the English Equivalency Examination represent the same level of performance on each part.

V. Technical Notes on Equating.

1) In the strictest sense, the score transformation procedure was employed to establish scores that are comparable, rather than truly equivalent. The terms "equating" and "equivalent scores" are fully appropriate only when the two tests are parallel forms designed to measure the same psychological function. Because the objective and essay sections of the English Equivalency Examination do not measure the same psychological function (see section XI), the score transformation techniques produces scores which are comparable but not equivalent. However, the mechanics of transformation are exactly the same for producing either comparable or equivalent scores, and the only difference is one of interpretation. For convenience, the term "equating" is used rather than a technically correct phrase, such as "establishing comparable scores."[3]

2) Two basic methods of equating are available, and when the score distributions are very similar in shape, these methods yield almost identical results. Given similar score distributions, the linear method, which defines equivalent scores as those represented by equal standard-score deviates, is preferable. The linear method is completely analytical (determined by a mathematical relationship) and is free from judgments of curve smoothing. However, if the two score distributions differ in shape, the linear method fails to adjust for this difference.[4] Thus, when the distributions have different shapes, or when the shape of one or both distributions is not known or cannot be accurately predicted, the curvilinear

---

[3]Angoff, W. H. Scales, Norms, and Equivalent Scores. In R. L. Thorndike (Ed.), Educational Measurement, 2nd ed., Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education, 1971, pp. 562-568; 590-597.

[4]ibid., p. 564.

or equipercentile method is to be preferred. If the two score distributions differ in shape, the equipercentile method will stretch or compress the score scale of the distribution being converted to fit the shape of the other distribution. This method defines equivalent scores as those scores which represent the same percentile rank on both distributions. Using the score conversion table (Table 4) for illustration, a raw essay score of 15 corresponds to a converted score of 48. The percentage of students scoring below 15 on the raw essay scale is the same as the percentage scoring below 48 on the objective scale. Thus, in the sense that the two scores represent the same relative rank (percentile) within their distributions, they are equivalent scores.

3) Percentile rank values for each point on the objective score scale were plotted on normal probability graph paper. These points were connected by a smoothed curve, and for the points on the curve corresponding to the percentile rank of each essay score the objective score equivalent was determined.[5]

4) If the two score distributions differ in shape, the use of the equipercentile equating method, as noted above, will modify the essay raw score scale by altering the relative distances of some scores from the median. This modification of the raw score scale will result in a less-than-perfect correlation between raw scores and converted scores. Another factor can also contribute to an imperfect correlation. The equating process is based on a sample of essay scores, but the conversion process is applied to the total population of essay scores. If the shape of the total essay distribution differs slightly from the shape of the sample essay distribution, additional discrepancy may result between the raw score distribution and the converted score distribution. The correlation between raw essay and converted essay scores for the 1981 English Equivalency Examination was .99. In prior years this value has consistently been above .99, and these very high correlations indicate that the linear equating method could have been used without inducing serious differences between the percentile ranks of equal scores on the converted essay and the objective score scales.

VI. Passing Scores.

1) Standard Passing Scores. An examinee was required to achieve a certain score on both the essay and objective parts of the examination in order to pass. These passing scores were added to arrive at a minimum composite passing score. Data from the CLEP norms sample and the Texas norms sample were used to establish the passing score for the objective part. An average score of 49 was obtained by C students in both of these samples on the form of the test in use at that time. In view of the difference in the difficulty level between the two forms of the test currently used, the project directors decided to set the passing score at 47 for the more difficult form of the test (see section IX, 1). This score most closely approximates a score of 49 on the form of the test used for the norming studies.

For the essay part of the examination, a score of 4 represented acceptable performance for a given essay reading. The criteria by which a reader was to distinguish between acceptable (4 or higher) and unacceptable (3 or lower) performance were carefully delineated in training sessions prior to the reading. These criteria represented a consensus among leading State University English professors. Each essay paper had two questions which were given two readings each, for a total of four reading scores. A passing score of 16 (on the 0 to 24 essay total score scale) would thus represent an average score of 4 on each of the four

---

[5] ibid., pp. 516, 571.

readings. However, a passing score of 16 would not allow any consideration for error in the scoring process. On the other hand, an essay score of 13 would mean that, on the average, only one of the four scores was acceptable.

The data from the CSU norms samples (Tables 5-9) were also evaluated in an attempt to set an appropriate and defensible passing score for the essay part of the examination. The basic premise was that the essay passing score should be at least as high as the average essay score of students who earned grades of C in freshman English in the CSU norms samples. For the Hayward norms sample the average grade of C students was 13.3; for the other samples C students scored somewhat lower, and a weighted mean of the scores of C students in all five samples was only 12.04.

Given the prevalence of grade inflation and the fact that a C grade often represents marginal performance, it could reasonably be argued that the essay passing score should at least be as high as the average score of norms students who received a grade of C or higher (A+B+C). A weighted mean of the scores of A+B+C students from the Hayward, Pomona, Fullerton, and Northridge samples gives a value of 13.66. (The performance of the Dominguez Hills sample was substantially below that of the other samples at all grade levels, and for this reason the Dominguez Hills data were excluded from this computation.) Therefore a score of 14 represents a level of performance slightly higher than that achieved by all students obtaining a C or higher in the four most representative norms samples. The evidence for a decrease in the difficulty of the essay questions that led to a higher essay passing score in 1980 was not present in 1981. Thus the essay passing score, which had been raised from 14 to 15 in 1980, was returned to 14 in 1981.

2) Compensation Model. As in all prior years except 1977, a limited amount of compensation on essay and objective scores was permitted. That is, one of the scores could drop below the passing level if the other score was sufficiently high. Inasmuch as the standard objective passing score was set at 47 and that of the essay was set at 14 (which converted to 45), the composite passing score was set at 92 (47 + 45). The limits within which compensation would operate were then determined by defining scores for both parts which represented absolute minima, below which no compensation could be justified. The objective minimum was set at 43, because this score minimized the number of A, B, and C students who would fail and the number of D and F students who would pass in both the CLEP norms sample and the Texas norms sample.

The essay minimum score was set at 13, which means that at least one of the four reading scores was satisfactory. However, for a candidate to pass on the strength of only one acceptable reading he or she had to achieve an objective score of 60 or higher, resulting in a composite score of at least 102. The limits of compensation, then, were as follows: essay scores of 13, which converted to 42, required an objective score of at least 60 with the resulting composite score of 102 or greater; objective scores of 43 through 46 called for an essay score of at least 16 (which converted to 51) in order to yield the required minimum composite score of 92.

VII. Placement Scores.

Following a procedure initiated in 1977, a middle score category called "pass for placement" was designated. Students who did not pass for credit but who scored above a lower set of criteria were granted a recommendation for

placement in a standard English composition course, and were also exempted from the English Placement Test (EPT). Students whose scores failed to meet these lower criteria received no recommendation and were required to take the EPT.

A simple conjunctive model was used for the "pass for placement" criteria. That is, no compensation was permitted, and a student had to achieve a certain minimum on both parts of the test. The essay score required for placement was set at 12 (36). A score of 12 can be represented by an average score of 3 on each of the four readings. The project directors concurred that a student who performs at this level probably has the competence necessary for minimally acceptable performance in a freshman composition class. The minimum objective score for placement was set at 35. This score represents a somewhat-better-than-chance performance on the multiple-choice part of the test, and is indicative of at least minimal competence in reading interpretation.

In addition, all persons who received objective scores below 35 but whose essay scores were 15 (48) or higher were included in the "pass for placement" group. Such a relatively high performance on the essay would argue for the student's readiness for a composition course, regardless of the low objective score. Twenty-three students were added to the placement group on this basis.

VIII. Pass Rates.

1) Objective, Essay, and Total Pass Rates. A total of 4014 students took both parts of the English Equivalency Examination. The 1226 students who passed the exam qualified to receive six semester units of credit in freshman English. The percentage of the total group which passed each part of the exam, using the basic pass criteria of 14 on the essay part and 47 on the objective part, is given in Table 2. The percentage passing the total exam without compensation (requiring 14 on the essay and 47 on the objective part) and the percentage passing with compensation (as defined in section VI, 2, above) are also listed.

TABLE 2

Pass/No Pass Analysis

	Objective Test		Essay		Total Exam			
					Without Compensation		With Compensation	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
PASS	1543	38.4	1793	44.7	1040	25.9	1226	30.5
NO PASS	2471	61.6	2221	55.3	2974	74.1	2788	69.5

It is evident from the pass percentages on the separate parts that a score of 47 on the objective part is somewhat more difficult than a score of 14 on the essay. Accordingly, 32.6% of those students who passed the objective part failed the essay, but 42.0% of those students who passed the essay failed the objective part. Expressed as percentages of the total group, 12.5% passed the objective test and failed the essay, and 18.8% passed the essay and failed the objective part. Prior to 1977, the pass criterion on the essay had been more rigorous than on the

objective part, but in the years 1977-1979 the passing score on the objective part was relatively more difficult. In 1980 the two parts were essentially equal in regard to the difficulty of the pass criteria; in 1981 the objective criterion again became more difficult. Because the part scores are reported on the same scale, the more difficult objective pass criterion in 1981 meant in effect that the objective part was given slightly more weight.

2) The Effect of Compensation. The effect of the compensatory model was to raise the total pass rate from 25.9% to 30.5%. By scoring 16 or higher on the essay, 170 students with objective score of 43 through 46 were permitted to pass. In addition, 16 students with essay scores of 13 but whose objective scores were 60 or higher were also allowed to pass.

IX. Technical Notes on Differences Among 1979, 1980, and 1981 Data.

1) Differences in Mean Objective Scores. The average objective score in 1981 (44.18) was 1.31 score points lower than in 1980 (45.49) and 1.63 points lower than in 1979 (45.81). These differences in mean scores apparently reflect two underlying factors: a) non-equivalence of test forms; b) decline in the ability of the candidate population over part of the period 1979 through 1981. Two forms of the CLEP test are used; the forms are evidently not equal in terms of difficulty. The easier form is used in even years, and the more difficult form in odd years. Prior to 1978, there was a consistent variation of about two points in the mean score from year to year, and the mean scores every other year exhibited only a very slight decline. This two-point year-to-year variation evidently reflected the difference in difficulty between the two forms, and the slight drop in mean score every other year apparently reflected a small yearly decline in the ability of the students who took the test. However, in 1978 the mean objective score dropped 1.17 points below the mean score (on the same form of the test) in 1976, and in 1979 the mean dropped 1.24 points below the 1977 level. The greatest decline was registered in 1980, when the mean score dropped 2.34 points below the 1978 level. These relatively large declines, demonstrated on both forms of the test, undoubtedly reflect a measurable drop in the ability of the test candidates between 1978 and 1980. This decline in student performance, though not large in an absolute sense, was a major factor in the rather sharp drop in the pass rate for these years (1978 = 41.3%; 1979 = 32.5%, 1980 = 29.5%). Although in 1981 the mean objective score was 1.63 points lower than in 1979, the ability level of the students apparently improved between 1980 and 1981. The difference between the 1980 and 1981 means should have been about two points if student ability had remained at the same level, but the actual difference was only 1.3 points. The simplest explanation for this relative increase of .7 score points for 1981 is a slightly higher level of ability in the 1981 candidate group. This increase in student ability, combined with the effect of the decision to lower the objective and essay pass scores, resulted in a slightly increased pass rate (30.5%) in 1981. The difference of 1.63 points between the 1979 and 1981 mean objective scores (on the same form of the test) is evidently entirely accounted for by the precipitate drop in candidate ability between 1979 and 1980.

Although the two forms of the CLEP test have been equated, converted scores on one form of the test evidently do not represent exactly the same level of performance as identical scores on the other form of the test. This inference is based on the likelihood that the two forms may differentially emphasize the measurement of several complex intellectual functions. Thus the conversion resulting from an equating study would not be totally independent of the individuals from whom the data were drawn, and its applicability to all student populations would be questionable. In other words, one form of the test could be easier than the other for a particular population. It should be noted that this

problem was communicated several years ago to test development specialists at the Educational Testing Service. These specialists have given assurance that the apparent anomaly in the equating process will not recur in two new forms of the test which will be available for the 1982 English Equivalency Examination.

2) Changes in Converted Score Equivalents. For the 1981 data, converted score equivalents for essay scores were almost identical to those obtained in 1980. For example, in the critical pass/fail range, essay scores of 14, 15, and 16 converted to 44, 48, and 52 in 1980, whereas in 1981 the same essay scores converted to 45, 48, and 51. Typically, the difference in converted score equivalents at the middle of the scale ranges from one to eight points from one year to the next. These variations are caused by yearly changes in the mean objective score or the mean essay score, or both. If the essay performance remains constant, a drop in objective scores results in lower converted score equivalents. Conversely, if the objective scores remain constant, a rise in essay scores produces an increase in converted score equivalents. In 1981, the increase in student performance partially offset the effect of using the more difficult form of the test, resulting in a decline of only 1.31 points in the mean objective score. However, because there was a commensurate drop (in relative scale distance) of .42 points in the mean essay score, the converted score equivalents remained essentially the same as in 1980.

X. Correlations Between Readings and Between Questions.

The correlation between the scores for the first and second readings of Question 1 was .72, and for Question 2 was .71. These figures, when expanded by the Spearman-Brown formula, represent the reliability of the grading procedure, and are discussed in the section on reliability. The scores for the first reading of Question 1 correlated .45 with the scores for the first reading of Question 2, and the scores for the second reading of both questions correlated .44.

When the two reading scores for each question are combined, the correlation between the questions scores is .52. This figure represents the degree of relationship between the two essay questions. Inasmuch as the proportion of shared variance is indicated by the square of the correlation, only 27% of the variance in each question was shared with the other. This suggests that the two questions drew upon essentially different types of writing ability. However, some of the underlying relationship between the two questions was obscured by the unreliability of the grading. An estimate of the true strength of this relationship can be obtained by removing the effect of the unreliability in the grading procedure. When the influence of grading unreliability is extracted from both questions by a procedure known as "correction for attenuation,"[6] the estimated relationship between the questions is .62. The correction for grading unreliability increases the proportion of shared variance to only 38%, which tends to confirm the inference that the two questions represented different domains of content, and sampled different facets of writing ability which are presumably developed in English Composition classes.

XI. Correlations Between Parts.

Correlations among the objective, raw essay total, and converted essay scores

---

[6] Magnusson, D., Test Theory, Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1967, pp. 147-149.

were computed for the total group. The objective and converted essay scores correlated .57, which is about optimal for an examination of this kind. If the relationship were much lower it would be difficult to justify the compensation which is allowed by combining the scores to form a composite. A substantially higher correlation would mean that each part overlapped the other to the extent that the use of both parts would be redundant.

The correlation of .99 between the raw and converted essay scores indicates a strong linear relationship between the scores. As noted above (section V, 4), this high degree of linearity means that the two score distibutions are very similar in shape, and the linear equating method could have been used without producing serious distortion.

XII. Reliability.

1) Reliability of the Objective Part. The reliability of the CLEP "Analysis and Interpretation of Literature" examination is .88 as reported in the CLEP Score Interpretation Guide.[7]

2) Reliability of the Essay Part. Because essay tests generally consist of only one or at most several items, it is not possible to compute reliability by split-half or internal consistency methods. The only alternative is "form-to-form" reliability, which entails giving two equivalent forms of a test to the same group of students. However, the preparation of an equivalent form for a one-or-two question test is not feasible, because one or two questions do not constitute an adequate sample from the domain of content. In lieu of a formal method of computing reliability, a method of estimation is available. Upper and lower limits of reliability can be established, with the certainty that the actual value lies somewhere between the two limits.

3) The Upper Limit. The correlation between grades on the first and second readings of each essay question represents the reliability of the grading procedure. Because unreliability due to grading is only one of several sources of error variance, the value for grading reliability will always be higher than the overall reliability value which includes all sources of error variance. Thus, grading reliability can be used as the upper limit of overall or actual reliability. For Question 1, the correlation between grades on both readings is .72, and for Question 2 the correlation is .71. These values are the reliabilities of a single reading. That is, the reliability of each reading of Question 1 is .72. Adding the reading scores to obtain a question score produces an increase in reliability, which is estimated by the Spearman-Brown formula.[8] The estimated reliability for Question 1 is .84, and that for Question 2 is .83.

Because the essay total score is the sum of the question scores, the reading reliability for the total is higher than that for either of the questions. The reading reliability of the essay total score is most appropriately estimated by the formula for computing the reliability of a linear composite, inasmuch as the two questions (as established above) are not alternate forms representing the same domain of content.[9] The reading reliability of the essay total score is

---

[7]Score Interpretation Guide, College-Level Examination Program, Princeton: College Entrance Examination Board, 1967, p. 31.

[8]Magnusson, op. cit., p. 74.

[9]Nunnally, J., Psychometric Theory, New York: McGraw-Hill, 1967, pp. 226-230.

estimated to be .89, and this value is taken as the upper limit of reliability for the total essay test.

4) The Lower Limit. The obtained correlation between Question 1 and Question 2 is used to estimate the lower limit of reliability. If each question were treated as a one-question test, the actual reliability per question could be obtained by giving an equivalent form of a question and correlating scores on both forms. Unreliability due both to grading and to fluctuations in performance would be reflected in such a "form-to-form" coefficient. It has already been demonstrated that Question 1 and Question 2 are not equivalent in terms of content. To the extent that the two questions are not equivalent, the correlation between them will underestimate the actual reliability of the question scores.

The correlation between the scores on Question 1 and Question 2 is .52. Again, because the essay total score includes both questions, the reliability of the total will be higher, and is estimated by the linear composite method to be .68. The actual reliability of the essay test therefore lies between the lower limit of .68 and the upper limit of .89.

5) Reliability of the Composite Scores. The estimated reliability of the composite scores, based on reliability coefficients of .88 for the objective test and between .68 and .89 for the essay part, is between .86 and .93.

6) Discrepant Reading Scores. As noted in section II, each essay was read twice. And, as the scores for each reading ranged from 0 to 6, the discrepancy between the two reading scores could be as large as 5 points (scores of 0 and 6 could not be assigned to the same essay, because 0 represents no attempt). Before 1979, discrepancies of three or more points between reading scores were always resolved (reduced to two points or less) by a third reading. Two-point differences were allowed to stand, unless one reading was pass and the other was fail; that is, unless the scores were 5-3 or 4-2. In such cases, a third reading resolved the difference by taking the middle value for both scores or by assigning one of the values for both scores. In all cases involving a third reading, the third reader was not allowed to see the first two scores assigned.

In 1979 the project directors adopted a more restrictive policy regarding discrepant reading scores. In addition to the correction of all differences of three or more points, all differences of two points were resolved by a third reading (in contrast to correcting only two-point differences of 5-3 or 4-2). In effect, only one-point score discrepancies were allowed to stand. This new procedure has resulted in slightly higher reliability coefficients than were obtained prior to 1979.

7) Reliability in Terms of Reading Score Discrepancies. Another means of expressing the reliability of essay scores is to indicate the frequency and magnitude of the discrepancies between the two reading scores for each question. Because each of the 4014 candidates wrote two essays and each essay was read twice, there were 4014 pairs of scores for each of the two questions. As noted above, since 1979 the policy has been to resolve all discrepancies of more than one point. Unfortunately, a small amount of error occurred in the discrepancy correction process, and 4 two-point discrepancies (out of 8028 score pairs) were not resolved.

For Question 1, 57.0% of the score pairs had no discrepancy. A discrepancy of one point occurred in 42.9% of the pairs, and a discrepancy of two points occurred (by error) in .07% of the cases. For Question 2, the figures were 55.7%

for no difference, 44.3% for one-point differences, and .02% (by error) for two-point differences. In summary, for the total reading the two reading scores were either identical or differed by only one point in 99.95% of the cases, and two-point differences occurred inadvertently in .05% of the cases.

XIII. Validity.

1) Validity of the Objective Part. Course grades or other indicators of classroom achievement can be correlated with test scores to obtain measures of concurrent validity. The CLEP Score Interpretation Guide reports correlations between scores on the "Analysis and Interpretation of Literature" examination and course grades before and after the final examination: the values are .42 and .54, respectively. As noted in the CLEP Guide, these correlations should be interpreted with caution because of lack of uniformity in the procedures by which the data were obtained.

TABLE 3

Norms Sample Validity Data

School	N	r essay/grade	r essay/rank
Northridge	110	.40	.32
Hayward	62	.55	.52
Pomona	49	.48	.41
Fullerton	43	.53	.62
Dominguez H.	41	.54	.52

2) Validity of the Essay Part. English composition grades earned by students in the CSU norms samples were correlated with essay total scores. These values ranged from .40 at Northridge to .55 at Hayward (see Table 3 under "r essay/grade"). Because class grades may be affected by factors unrelated to competence, such as absences or incomplete assignments, the instructors were also asked to rank their students on a six-point scale of general ability in the course. It was anticipated that the ranks would more accurately reflect the students' abilities than would the course grades, resulting in higher correlations with the essay scores. However, as in all prior years, the data were inconclusive. The correlations of essay scores with ranks were slightly lower than the essay/grade correlations, with the exception of the Fullerton sample. Such relatively small differences between correlations have no substantive meaning, particularly in view of the rather small number of cases involved. It should also be noted that all the values cited in this section reflect the unreliability in grading due to the various standards used by different instructors, and should be interpreted only as gross approximations, if not as underestimates, of concurrent validity.

TABLE 4

SCORE CONVERSION TABLE

June 1981

Essay Total Score	Converted Score
24	71
23	70
22	69
21	68
20	65
19	62
18	58
17	54
16	51
15	48
14	45
13	42
12	39
11	36
10	33
9	30
8	28
7	27
6	26
5	25
4	24
3	23
2	22
1	21
0	20

TABLE 5

1981 NORMS SAMPLE, NORTHRIDGE

English 155 & 255

Grade	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Range
A	16	15.13	2.12	11-19
B	54	13.96	2.45	8-19
C	37	11.89	2.69	5-17
D	3	12.33	3.77	7-15
A+B	70	14.23	2.43	8-19
A+B+C	107	13.42	2.76	5-19
C+D	40	11.93	2.79	5-17
TOTAL	110	13.40	2.79	5-19

TABLE 6

1981 NORMS SAMPLE, HAYWARD

English 203 & 204

Grade	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Range
A	8	16.88	2.09	15-22
B	23	14.74	2.45	10-18
C	26	13.27	2.81	9-20
D	3	12.00	14.14	11-14
F	2	8.00	1.00	7-9
A+B	31	15.29	2.54	10-22
A+B+C	57	14.37	2.85	9-22
C+D	29	13.14	2.73	9-20
D+F	5	10.40	2.33	7-14
TOTAL	62	14.05	3.01	7-22

TABLE 7

1981 NORMS SAMPLE, POMONA

English 105

Grade	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Range
A	10	16.10	3.08	11-21
B	13	13.69	2.67	9-20
C	25	12.48	2.58	7-19
D	1	9.00	0	0
A+B	23	14.74	3.11	9-21
A+B+C	48	13.56	3.06	7-21
C+D	26	12.35	2.62	7-19
TOTAL	49	13.47	3.10	7-21

TABLE 8

1981 NORMS SAMPLE, FULLERTON

English 101

Grade	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Range
A	7	14.71	3.01	9-18
B	15	14.40	1.54	12-18
C	13	11.54	2.98	7-17
D	6	10.17	3.24	7-15
F	2	10.50	.50	10-11
A+B	22	14.50	2.13	9-18
A+B+C	35	13.40	2.86	7-18
C+D	19	11.11	3.13	7-17
D+F	8	10.25	2.82	7-15
TOTAL	43	12.81	3.10	7-18

TABLE 9

1981 NORMS SAMPLE, DOMINGUEZ HILLS

English 100

Grade	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Range
A	6	13.50	2.99	8-17
B	16	11.81	2.30	8-16
C	15	10.00	1.63	7-13
F	4	8.50	2.50	5-12
A+B	22	12.27	2.61	8-17
A+B+C	37	11.35	2.53	7-17
TOTAL	41	11.07	2.66	5-17

APPENDIX A

ENGLISH EQUIVALENCY EXAMINATION BUDGET SUMMARY

Start-Up Costs:	79-80	80-81
Personal Services	18,298	23,803
Operating Expenses	14,146	13,496
TOTAL	32,444	37,299

Note: The above includes administrative time, secretarial and student assistant help, printing (brochure and essay test questions), mailing, and travel (including that of various faculty committees).

Reading Costs:		
Readers and Professional Team	17,650	22,050
Aides	1,800	2,000
Operating Costs	13,580	17,435
TOTAL	32,030	41,485

Note: The above operating expenses include transportation and per diem.

Follow-up Costs:		
Summer Administration	3,000	3,000

Assistance underwritten by The California State University and Colleges campuses of San Jose, Pomona, and San Bernardino; and by the Office of the Chancellor.

Office Space, San Jose and San Bernardino
Telephone Usage, San Jose
Computer Time, Pomona
Key Punch Operator, Pomona
Statistician, Pomona
Computer Time for Follow-Up Study, Chancellor's Office
Development of Follow-Up Study, Chancellor's Office

APPENDIX B

REPORT OF THE EEE ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE
TO THE CSUC ENGLISH COUNCIL

April, 1980

The committee met on January 18 and April 23, 1980. It received reports and statements by EEE directors, including details of the history and present use of the CLEP portion of the examination. We also had reports from the CSUC campuses about use of the EEE credits, as well as detailed information about the content of their introductory composition courses.

As a result of our discussion, and a review of the present and alternative multiple-choice tests, we recommend the following to the Council:

1. We reconfirm our endorsement of the EEE as now structured, i.e., with a two-part 90 minute essay test and a 90 minute multiple-choice reading test at the college level. We find that structure appropriate for its curriculum impact with the high schools, for the goals of freshman English in college, and for a reliable equivalency examination.

2. We have some reservations about the particular multiple-choice test now in use, the CLEP Subject Examination, "Analysis and Interpretation of Literature." That examination, which is not intended for freshman English courses, seems to be somewhat out of date, and to examine matters of literary form and nomenclature, as well as reading for meaning. We would prefer a test with more attention to reading comprehension and to the material normally read in composition courses, such as expository writing. Among the English departments in the CSUC, there is wide variety in the second course in composition. Some second courses are introductions to literature; some are advanced composition courses in which literature is not read or is read as stimulus material for general expository writing. Few of these courses deal with literature in the way demanded by the "Analysis and Interpretation of Literature" test, which is designed for one year courses in literature. Thus there is some discrepancy between the present nature of the CLEP exam and its validity as a challenge mechanism for all CSUC courses in freshman composition.

   The original 1972 decision by the English Council to use this CLEP exam was based on the need for a reliable instrument that tests analytic reading of all kinds of writing, including, but not restricted to, imaginative literature. The "Analysis and Interpretation of Literature" reliably tests the substantial reading component of freshman English, but it does not deal with analytic reading aside from imaginative literature. For this reason, the original decision to use this exam was seen as "a responsible short-term solution," professionally justified but not wholly satisfactory. It is still justified, for the same reasons--it is responsive to a primary concern of freshman English and does serve as an

effective barrier to the granting of credit to those who require the reading instruction that is part of the course; nevertheless, the present CLEP exam still falls short of the ideal test for our purpose.

However, the present CLEP exam is being revised, and it appears that the emphasis on specialized knowledge and the use of literary terminology will be reduced. It is not possible to review this new test at this time; it will be pre-tested on some CSUC campuses this year, and normed on the other campuses next year. We urge that all English departments in the system participate in this process, so that the test might better reflect our students' abilities and our needs.

We also recommend that the English Council approve continued administration of the "Analysis and Interpretation of Literature" test, since a multiple-choice reading test is necessary to validate the essay writing portion of the EEE and since some English departments in the CSUC do offer "Introduction to Literature" as their second course in composition. However, because we are concerned that the CLEP exam be more appropriate to our introductory courses, we recommend that the Council withhold its final approval of this particular test until the new version can be studied. A publication date has not been set, but should occur in 1981.

3. We recommend that the Council take a strong position that EEE readers by paid on a parity with other professional consultants working on an hourly basis.

4. We request that we be continued as a committee to review the new version of the CLEP test, to attempt to influence it in the direction of our concerns, and to review the norm data when they become available. We would also seek out for review any other multiple-choice reading test that might be more appropriate to the EEE.

5. We believe that the directors of the EEE should be commended by the Council for the superb job they have done, especially in their administrative duties and on the essay portion of the EEE. Our continuing concern with the CLEP exam should not be construed as criticism of the directors or of the general principles underlying the EEE, nor as in any way casting doubt on the validity of past exams.

Richard Day, Humboldt
Frank Hubbard, Sacramento
Ed White, San Bernardino
Dan Buerger, San Jose (Chair)

EEE COURSE CREDIT FOR THE EEE ON CSUC CAMPUSES

April, 1980

CAMPUS	1ST COURSE IN COMP.	REQ.	LITERATURE COMPONENT	EEE CREDIT	2ND COURSE IN COMP. OR FOR EEE CRE.	REQ.	LITERATURE COMPONENT	EEE CREDIT
Bakersfield	Eng. 100: Comp.	yes	no	yes	Eng. 100: Expos. Writ.	yes	no	no
Chico	Eng. 1	yes	permitted, but very limited	yes	Eng. 2	no	no	(Eng.101: Intro.Lit) yes
Dominguez Hills	Eng. 100: Oral & Writ. Expression	yes	no	yes	Eng. 101	yes	no	no
Fresno	Eng. 1	yes	permitted	yes	Eng. 20 Intro. to Lit. (4 units)	no	yes	(Eng.190: Mod Fict) yes
Fullerton	Eng. 101	yes	no exp. writ.	yes	none 201 focus on res. pap.&libr. skills	no	no	yes
Hayward	Eng. 1001: Exp.Writ.	yes	no	yes	Eng. 2030 (Fict.)	no	yes	yes
Humboldt	Eng. 1: exp.writ. & crt. rdg;or Eng. 2 rdg.& comp-thematic apr.	yes	not permtd in Eng. 1	yes	none			5qtr. Units elect. credit given
Long Beach	Eng. 100	yes	no	yes	Eng. 101	no	permtd	yes
Los Angeles	Eng. 190	yes	permtd, but very limited	yes	Eng. 250 "Under Lit."	no	yes	yes
Northridge	Eng. 155 Exp.Writ.	yes	no	yes	Eng. 255 Intro. Lit.	no	yes	yes
Pomona	Eng. 104 (based on exper. writ)	yes	permtd-but very ltd.	yes	Eng. 105 (based on res.paper)	no	permtd but very limited	yes (plus 1 free elect unit)
Sacramento	Eng. 1A	yes	permtd	no	Eng. 1B	no	yes	yes
San Bdno.	Eng. 101	yes	permtd-but ltd. use	yes	Eng. 170 Intro. to Lit.	no	yes	yes
San Diego	Eng. 100 plus options	yes	no	yes	Eng. 200 plus options	yes	permtd	yes
San Francisco	Eng. 106	yes	no	yes	Eng. 107	no	yes	yes
San Jose	Eng. 1A	yes	permtd-but very ltd.	yes	Eng. 1B	yes	permtd	yes
San Luis Obispo	Eng. 104	yes	permtd-but focus on exp.	yes	Eng. 105	no	permtd but very ltd	yes
Sonoma	Eng. 101	yes	permtd-but seldom used	yes	Eng. 214 Intro. to Lit.	no	yes	yes
Stanislaus	Eng. 1000	yes	permtd-but very ltd.	yes	Eng. 1010 Intro to Lit (non-majors)	no	yes	yes
					Eng. 2010 Crit. Apr. to Lit.	no	yes	no

ENGLISH EQUIVALENCY EXAMINATION

DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS – 1980 ADMINISTRATION

Division of Institutional Research
CSUC Office of the Chancellor
April 1981

The following tables present data describing the group of students who participated in the 1980 administration of the English Equivalency Examination. Tables are included which detail performance data and age characteristics of four groups of participants: (1) those who passed for unit credit; (2) those who were *not* awarded unit credit; (3) those who scored highly enough (including those who passed for credit) to satisfy the English Placement Test requirements; and (4) those who received neither unit nor placement credit.

TOTAL ENROLLED PARTICIPANT POPULATION BY AGE

Non-Passers				Placement Passers				Credit Passers				Total			
Age	N	Rel. %	Cum. %	Age	N	Rel. %	Cum. %	Age	N	Rel. %	Cum. %	Age	N	Rel. %	Cum. %
16 & Under	23	3.1	3.1	16 & Under	39	2.4	2.4	16 & Under	32	3.2	3.2	16 & Under	94	2.8	2.8
17	510	68.8	71.9	17	1,239	75.8	78.2	17	693	69.4	72.6	17	2,442	72.4	75.1
18	141	19.0	91.0	18	230	14.1	92.2	18	107	10.7	83.3	18	478	14.2	89.3
19	20	2.7	93.6	19	40	2.4	94.7	19	32	3.2	86.5	19	92	2.7	92.0
20	16	2.2	95.8	20	18	1.1	95.8	20	20	2.0	88.5	20	54	1.6	93.6
21	8	1.1	96.9	21	16	1.0	96.8	21	12	1.2	89.7	21	36	1.1	94.7
22	6	0.8	97.7	22	8	0.5	97.2	22	11	1.1	90.8	22	25	0.7	95.4
23	–	–	–	23	12	0.7	98.0	23	10	1.0	91.8	23	22	0.7	96.1
24	4	0.5	98.2	24	6	0.4	98.3	24	10	1.0	92.8	24	20	0.6	96.7
25-29	6	0.8	99.1	25-29	14	0.9	99.2	25-29	37	3.7	96.5	25-29	57	1.7	98.4
30-34	3	0.4	99.5	30-34	5	0.3	99.5	30-34	19	1.9	98.4	30-34	27	0.8	99.2
35 & Over	4	0.5	100.0	35 & Over	8	0.5	100.0	35 & Over	16	1.6	100.0	35 & Over	28	0.8	100.0
All Ages	741	100.0	–	All Ages	1,635	100.0	–	All Ages	999	100.0	–	All Ages	3,375	100.0	–

NOTE: Sex and age data were unavailable for 1,435 participants

TCSUC – Institutional Research
April 1981

MALE ENROLLED PARTICIPANT POPULATION BY AGE

Non-Passers				Placement Passers				Credit Passers				Total			
Age	N	Rel. %	Cum. %	Age	N	Rel. %	Cum. %	Age	N	Rel. %	Cum. %	Age	N	Rel. %	Cum. %
16 & Under	9	2.5	2.5	16 and Under	10	1.6	1.6	16 & Under	6	1.8	1.8	16 & Under	25	1.9	1.9
17	235	64.7	64.7	17	467	72.6	74.2	17	222	67.1	68.9	17	924	69.1	71.0
18	80	22.0	86.8	18	112	17.4	91.6	18	38	11.5	80.4	18	230	17.2	88.2
19	12	3.3	90.1	19	15	2.3	93.9	19	14	4.2	84.6	19	41	3.1	91.2
20	8	2.2	94.8	20	8	1.2	95.2	20	9	2.7	87.3	20	25	1.9	93.1
21	5	1.4	96.1	21	6	0.9	96.1	21	5	1.5	88.8	21	16	1.2	94.3
22	2	0.6	96.7	22	5	0.8	96.9	22	4	1.2	90.0	22	11	0.8	95.1
23	3	0.8	97.5	23	7	1.1	98.0	23	4	1.2	91.2	23	14	1.0	96.2
24	–	–	–	24	4	0.6	98.6	24	4	1.2	92.4	24	8	0.6	96.8
25-29	4	1.1	98.6	25-29	5	0.8	99.4	25-29	15	4.5	97.0	25-29	24	1.8	98.6
30-34	2	0.6	99.2	30-34	1	0.2	99.5	30-34	7	2.1	99.1	30-34	10	0.7	99.3
35 & Over	3	0.8	100.0	35 & Over	3	0.5	100.0	35 & Over	3	0.9	100.0	35 & Over	9	0.7	100.0
All Ages	363	100.0	–	All Ages	643	100.0	–	All Ages	331	100.0	–	All Ages	1,337	100.0	–

NOTE: Sex and age data were unavailable for 1,435 participants

TCSUC – Institutional Research
April 1981

FEMALE ENROLLED PARTICIPANT POPULATION BY AGE

Age	Non-Passers N	Non-Passers Rel. %	Non-Passers Cum. %	Age	Placement Passers N	Placement Passers Rel. %	Placement Passers Cum. %	Age	Credit Passers N	Credit Passers Rel. %	Credit Passers Cum. %	Age	Total N	Total Rel. %	Total Cum. %
16 & Under	14	3.7	3.7	16 & Under	29	2.9	2.9	16 and Under	26	3.9	3.9	16 & Under	69	3.4	3.4
17	275	72.8	76.5	17	772	77.8	80.7	17	471	70.5	74.4	17	1,518	74.5	77.9
18	61	16.1	92.6	18	118	11.9	92.6	18	69	10.3	84.7	18	248	12.2	90.0
19	8	2.1	94.7	19	25	2.5	95.2	19	18	2.7	87.4	19	51	2.5	92.5
20	8	2.1	96.8	20	10	1.0	96.2	20	11	1.6	89.1	20	29	1.4	94.0
21	3	0.8	97.6	21	10	1.0	97.2	21	7	1.0	90.1	21	20	1.0	94.9
22	4	1.1	98.7	22	3	0.3	97.5	22	7	1.0	91.2	22	14	0.7	95.6
23	1	0.3	98.9	23	5	0.5	98.0	23	6	0.9	92.1	23	12	0.6	96.2
24	–	–	–	24	2	0.2	98.2	24	6	0.9	93.0	24	8	0.4	96.6
25-29	2	0.5	99.5	25-29	9	0.9	99.1	25-29	22	3.3	96.3	25-29	33	1.6	98.2
30-34	1	0.3	99.7	30-34	4	0.4	99.5	30-34	12	1.8	98.1	30-34	17	0.8	99.1
35 & Over	1	0.3	100.0	35 & Over	5	0.5	100.0	35 & Over	13	1.9	100.0	35 & Over	19	0.9	100.0
All Ages	378	100.0	–	All Ages	992	100.0	–	All Ages	668	100.0	–	All Ages	2,038	100.0	–

NOTE: Sex and age data were unavailable for 1,435 participants

TCSUC – Institutional Research
April 1981

DISTRIBUTION OF CONVERTED ESSAY SCORES OF TOTAL PARTICIPANT POPULATION

Score	Frequency	Relative Percent	Cumulative Percent
20-24	33	0.7	0.7
25-29	230	4.8	5.5
30-34	638	13.3	18.7
35-39	609	12.7	31.4
40-44	1,529	31.8	63.2
45-49	662	13.8	76.9
50-54	485	10.1	87.0
55-59	296	6.2	93.2
60-64	259	5.4	98.5
65-69	68	1.4	99.9
70-71	2	0.0	100.0
Total	4,811	100.0	–

Mean = 43.0 Median = 43.7 Standard Deviation = 9.4

111

TCSUC – Institutional Research
April 1981

DISTRIBUTION OF OBJECTIVE SCORES OF TOTAL PARTICIPANT POPULATION

Score	Frequency	Relative Percent	Cumulative Percent
20-24	22	0.5	0.5
25-29	181	3.7	4.2
30-34	395	8.2	12.3
35-39	813	16.8	29.1
40-44	908	18.7	47.9
45-49	920	19.0	66.9
50-54	701	14.5	81.3
55-59	512	10.6	91.9
60-64	279	5.8	97.6
65-69	97	2.0	99.6
70-72	17	0.4	100.0
Total	4,845	100.0	–

Mean = 45.4 Median = 44.9 Standard Deviation = 9.5

TCSUC – Institutional Research
April 1981

DISTRIBUTION OF COMPOSITE SCORES OF TOTAL PARTICIPANT POPULATION

Score	Frequency	Relative Percent	Cumulative Percent
40-49	11	0.2	0.2
50-59	168	3.5	3.7
60-69	484	10.1	13.8
70-79	831	17.3	31.1
80-89	1,085	22.6	53.6
90-99	980	20.4	74.0
100-109	704	14.6	88.6
110-119	368	7.7	96.3
120-129	149	3.1	99.4
130-139	29	0.6	99.9
140-141	1	0.0	100.0
Total	4,810	100.0	–

Mean = 88.6 Median = 88.0 Standard Deviation = 16.7

TCSUC – Institutional Research
April 1981

113

DISTRIBUTION OF CONVERTED ESSAY SCORES OF PARTICIPANTS WHO PASSED FOR CREDIT

Score	Frequency	Relative Percent	Cumulative Percent
44	181	12.8	12.8
48	318	22.4	35.2
52	359	25.3	60.6
56	249	17.6	78.1
60	148	10.4	88.6
63	93	6.6	95.1
65	35	2.5	97.6
67	25	1.8	99.4
69	7	0.5	99.9
71	2	0.1	100.0
Total	1,417	100.0	–

Mean = 53.0 Median = 52.1 Standard Deviation = 6.2

TCSUC – Institutional Research
April 1981

DISTRIBUTION OF OBJECTIVE SCORES OF PARTICIPANTS WHO PASSED FOR CREDIT

Score	Frequency	Relative Percent	Cumulative Percent
45-47	113	8.0	8.0
48-50	163	11.5	19.5
51-53	321	22.7	42.1
54-56	258	18.2	60.3
57-59	215	15.2	75.5
60-62	148	10.4	86.0
63-65	129	9.1	95.1
66-68	49	3.5	98.5
69-71	19	1.3	99.9
72	2	0.1	100.0
Total	1,417	100.0	–

Mean = 55.4 Median = 55.0 Standard Deviation = 5.8

TCSUC – Institutional Research
April 1981

DISTRIBUTION OF COMPOSITE SCORES OF PARTICIPANTS WHO PASSED FOR CREDIT

Score	Frequency	Relative Percent	Cumulative Percent
97-99	218	15.4	15.4
100-104	356	25.1	40.5
105-109	297	21.0	61.5
110-114	211	14.9	76.4
115-119	156	11.0	87.4
120-124	97	6.8	94.2
125-129	52	3.7	97.9
130-134	23	1.6	99.5
135-139	6	0.4	99.9
140-141	1	0.0	100.0
Total	1,417	100.0	–

Mean = 108.5 Median = 106.8 Standard Deviation = 8.7

TCSUC – Institutional Research
April 1981

DISTRIBUTION OF CONVERTED ESSAY SCORES OF PARTICIPANTS WHO DID NOT PASS FOR CREDIT

Score	Frequency	Relative Percent	Cumulative Percent
20-24	33	1.0	1.0
25-29	230	6.8	7.8
30-34	638	18.8	26.6
35-39	609	17.9	44.5
40-44	1,347	39.7	84.2
45-49	344	10.1	94.3
50-54	126	3.7	98.1
55-59	47	1.4	99.4
60-64	18	0.5	99.9
65-67	1	0.0	100.0
Total	3,393	100.0	–

Mean = 38.9 Median = 39.8 Standard Deviation = 7.1

TCSUC – Institutional Research
April 1981

117

DISTRIBUTION OF OBJECTIVE SCORES OF PARTICIPANTS WHO DID NOT PASS FOR CREDIT

Score	Frequency	Relative Percent	Cumulative Percent
22-24	21	0.6	0.6
25-29	172	5.1	5.7
30-34	387	11.4	17.1
35-39	808	23.8	40.9
40-44	904	26.6	67.6
45-49	677	20.0	87.5
50-54	272	8.0	95.5
55-59	106	3.1	98.6
60-64	36	1.1	99.7
65-69	8	0.2	99.9
70-71	2	0.0	100.0
Total	3,393	100.0	–

Mean = 41.3 Median = 41.0 Standard Deviation = 7.5

TCSUC – Institutional Research
April 1981

DISTRIBUTION OF COMPOSITE SCORES OF PARTICIPANTS WHO DID NOT PASS FOR CREDIT

Score	Frequency	Relative Percent	Cumulative Percent
43-44	1	0.0	0.0
45-49	10	0.3	0.3
50-54	61	1.8	2.1
55-59	107	3.2	5.3
60-64	176	5.2	10.5
65-69	308	9.1	19.5
70-74	337	9.9	29.5
75-79	494	14.6	44.0
80-84	517	15.2	59.3
85-89	568	16.7	76.0
90-94	486	14.3	90.3
95-99	276	8.1	98.5
100-104	42	1.2	99.7
105-109	9	0.3	99.9
110	1	0.0	100.0
Total	3,393	100.0	–

Mean = 80.2 Median = 81.3 Standard Deviation = 11.4

TCSUC – Institutional Research
April 1981

DISTRIBUTION OF CONVERTED ESSAY SCORES OF PARTICIPANTS WHO PASSED FOR CREDIT OR PLACEMENT

Score	Frequency	Relative Percent	Cumulative Percent
36-39	521	14.2	14.2
40-44	1,413	38.4	52.6
45-49	643	17.5	70.1
50-54	478	13.0	83.1
55-59	294	8.0	91.1
60-64	257	7.0	98.1
65-69	68	1.8	99.9
70-71	2	0.0	100.0
Total	3,676	100.0	–

Mean = 46.4 Median = 44.4 Standard Deviation = 7.7

TCSUC – Institutional Research
April 1981

DISTRIBUTION OF OBJECTIVE SCORES OF PARTICIPANTS WHO PASSED FOR CREDIT OR PLACEMENT

Score	Frequency	Relative Percent	Cumulative Percent
35-39	568	15.5	15.5
40-44	746	20.3	35.7
45-49	840	22.9	58.6
50-54	653	17.8	76.4
55-59	489	13.3	89.7
60-64	268	7.3	97.0
65-69	96	2.6	99.6
70-72	16	0.4	100.0
Total	3,676	100.0	–

Mean = 48.3 Median = 47.7 Standard Deviation = 8.1

DISTRIBUTION OF COMPOSITE SCORES OF PARTICIPANTS WHO PASSED FOR CREDIT OR PLACEMENT

Score	Frequency	Relative Percent	Cumulative Percent
71-79	476	12.9	12.9
80-89	982	26.7	26.7
90-99	968	26.3	66.0
100-109	703	19.1	85.1
110-119	368	10.0	95.1
120-129	149	4.1	99.2
130-139	29	0.8	99.9
140-141	1	0.0	100.0
Total	3,676	100.0	–

Mean = 94.8 Median = 93.1 Standard Deviation = 13.4

TCSUC – Institutional Research
April 1981

DISTRIBUTION OF CONVERTED ESSAY SCORES OF PARTICIPANTS WHO DID NOT PASS FOR CREDIT OR PLACEMENT

Score	Frequency	Relative Percent	Cumulative Percent
20-24	33	2.9	2.9
25-29	230	20.3	23.2
30-34	638	56.3	79.5
35-39	88	7.8	87.2
40-44	115	10.1	97.4
45-49	19	1.7	99.0
50-54	7	0.6	99.6
55-59	2	0.2	99.8
60	2	0.2	100.0
Total	1,134	100.0	–

Mean = 32.1 Median = 31.7 Standard Deviation = 5.3

TCSUC – Institutional Research
April 1981

123

DISTRIBUTION OF OBJECTIVE SCORES OF PARTICIPANTS WHO DID NOT PASS FOR CREDIT OR PLACEMENT

Score	Frequency	Relative Percent	Cumulative Percent
20-24	21	1.9	1.9
25-29	172	15.2	17.0
30-34	387	34.1	51.1
35-39	240	21.2	72.3
40-44	158	13.9	86.2
45-49	75	6.6	92.9
50-54	46	4.1	96.9
55-59	22	1.9	98.9
60-64	11	1.0	99.8
65-69	1	0.1	99.9
70-71	1	0.1	100.0
Total	1,134	100.0	–

Mean = 36.3 Median = 34.3 Standard Deviation = 7.7

TCSUC – Institutional Research
April 1981

DISTRIBUTION OF COMPOSITE SCORES OF PARTICIPANTS WHO DID NOT PASS FOR CREDIT OR PLACEMENT

Score	Frequency	Relative Percent	Cumulative Percent
48-49	6	0.5	0.5
50-54	61	5.4	5.9
55-59	107	9.5	15.4
60-64	176	15.6	31.0
65-69	308	27.3	58.3
70-74	233	20.6	78.9
75-79	122	10.8	89.7
80-84	65	5.8	95.5
85-89	38	3.4	98.8
90-94	11	1.0	99.8
95-99	1	0.1	99.9
100-103	1	0.1	100.0
Total	1,129	100.0	–

Mean = 68.4 Median = 68.4 Standard Deviation = 8.5

INTERRCORRELATIONS AMONG GROUPED ESSAY AND COMPOSITE SCORES FOR THE TOTAL PARTICIPANT POPULATION

	Question 1	Question 2	Essay Total	Conv. Essay	Objective	Composite
Question 1		0.5414	0.8489	0.8376	0.4547	0.7328
Question 2			0.8647	0.8488	0.4966	0.7617
Essay Total				0.9840	0.5672	0.8750
Converted Essay					0.5647	0.8836
Objective						0.8854

TCSUC – Institutional Research
April 1981

INTERCORRELATIONS AMONG PART AND COMPOSITE SCORES FOR THE TOTAL PARTICIPANT POPULATION

	Essay No. 1		Essay No. 2					
	Read. 1	Read. 2	Read. 1	Read. 2	Essay Total	Essay Conv.	Objective	Composite
Essay No. 1								
Read. 1		0.7224	0.4774	0.4596	0.7790	0.7696	0.4264	0.6758
Read. 2			0.4675	0.4621	0.7762	0.7677	0.4173	0.6691
Essay No. 2								
Read. 1				0.7253	0.8009	0.7875	0.4653	0.7073
Read. 2					0.7903	0.7766	0.4569	0.6962
Essay Total						0.9840	0.5672	0.8750
Essay Conv.							0.5647	0.8836
Objective								0.8854

TCSUC – Institutional Research
April 1981

THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY AND COLLEGES
ENROLLED EEE PARTICIPANTS - FALL 1980
DISTRIBUTION BY CAMPUS

Campus	Passing for Credit		Passing for Placement		Not Passing		Total	
	Number	Percent Campus Enrolled	Number	Percent Campus Enrolled	Number	Percent Campus Enrolled	Number	Percent Total Enrolled
Bakersfield	7	35.0	10	50.0	3	15.0	20	0.6
Chico	55	26.3	103	49.3	51	24.4	209	6.2
Dominguez Hills	3	11.1	16	59.3	8	29.6	27	0.8
Fresno	54	31.4	83	48.3	35	20.3	172	5.1
Fullerton	101	31.6	162	50.6	57	17.8	320	9.4
Hayward	22	19.8	64	57.7	25	22.5	111	3.3
Humboldt	47	42.3	50	45.0	14	12.6	111	3.3
Long Beach	66	24.5	126	46.8	77	28.6	269	7.9
Los Angeles	17	16.0	35	33.0	54	50.9	106	3.1
Northridge	73	31.5	110	47.4	49	21.1	232	6.8
Pomona	68	27.0	114	45.2	70	27.8	252	7.4
Sacramento	62	35.4	80	45.7	33	18.9	175	5.2
San Bernardino	12	41.4	12	41.4	5	17.2	29	0.9
San Diego	116	24.4	261	54.8	99	20.8	476	14.0
San Francisco	61	51.7	36	30.5	21	17.8	118	3.5
San Jose	108	30.7	153	43.5	91	25.9	352	10.4
San Luis Obispo	107	30.4	197	56.0	48	13.6	352	10.4
Sonoma	13	38.2	12	35.3	9	26.5	34	0.1
Stanislaus	9	29.0	12	38.7	10	32.3	31	0.1
All Campuses	1,001	29.5	1,636	48.2	759	22.3	3,396	100.0

TCSUC - Institutional Research
April 1981

ENGLISH EQUIVALENCY EXAMINATION

DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS - 1981 ADMINISTRATION

Division of Institutional Research
CSU Office of the Chancellor
February 1982

The following tables present data describing the group of students who participated in the 1981 administration of the English Equivalency Examination. Tables are included which detail performance data and age characteristics of four groups of participants: (1) those who passed for unit credit; (2) those who were *not* awarded unit credit; (3) those who scored highly enough (including those who passed for credit) to satisfy the English Placement Test requirements; and (4) those who received neither unit nor placement credit.

TOTAL ENROLLED PARTICIPANT POPULATION BY AGE

Age	Non-Passers			Age	Placement Passers			Age	Credit Passers			Age	Total		
	N	Rel.%	Cum.%		N	Rel.%	Cum.%		N	Rel.%	Cum.%		N	Rel.%	Cum.%
16 & Under	12	1.5	1.5	16 & Under	27	2.3	2.3	16 & Under	27	3.0	3.0	16 & Under	66	2.3	2.3
17	577	73.3	74.8	17	921	79.8	82.1	17	621	68.6	71.6	17	2,119	74.5	76.8
18	132	16.8	91.6	18	123	10.7	92.8	18	100	11.0	82.7	18	355	12.5	89.2
19	21	2.7	94.3	19	27	2.3	95.1	19	21	2.3	85.0	19	69	2.4	91.7
20	12	1.5	95.8	20	12	1.0	96.2	20	18	2.0	87.0	20	42	1.5	93.1
21	5	0.6	96.4	21	6	0.5	96.7	21	16	1.8	88.7	21	27	0.9	94.1
22	6	0.8	97.2	22	6	0.5	97.2	22	16	1.8	90.5	22	28	1.0	95.1
23	5	0.6	97.8	23	8	0.7	97.9	23	10	1.1	91.6	23	23	0.8	95.9
24	5	0.6	98.5	24	4	0.3	98.3	24	12	1.3	92.9	24	21	0.7	96.6
25-29	8	1.0	99.5	25-29	9	0.8	99.0	25-29	39	4.3	97.2	25-29	56	2.0	98.6
30-34	1	0.1	99.6	30-34	4	0.3	99.4	30-34	12	1.3	98.6	30-34	17	0.6	99.2
35 & Over	3	0.4	100.0	35 & Over	7	0.6	100.0	35 & Over	13	1.4	100.0	35 & Over	23	0.8	100.0
All Ages	787	100.0	-	All Ages	1,154	100.0	-	All Ages	905	100.0	-	All Ages	2,846	100.0	-

Note: Sex and age data were unavailable for 1,190 participants.

TCSU - Institutional Research
February 1982

MALE ENROLLED PARTICIPANT POPULATION BY AGE

Age	Non-Passers			Age	Placement Passers			Age	Credit Passers			Age	Total		
	N	Rel.%	Cum.%		N	Rel.%	Cum.%		N	Rel.%	Cum.%		N	Rel.%	Cum.%
16 & Under	4	1.1	1.1	16 & Under	13	2.6	2.6	16 & Under	9	3.2	3.2	16 & Under	26	2.3	2.3
17	249	68.2	69.3	17	376	76.4	79.1	17	192	68.8	72.0	17	817	71.9	74.2
18	72	19.7	89.0	18	63	12.8	92.0	18	35	12.5	84.6	18	170	15.0	89.2
19	7	1.9	91.0	19	9	1.8	94.0	19	7	2.5	87.1	19	23	2.0	91.2
20	10	2.7	94.0	20	6	1.2	94.9	20	5	1.8	88.9	20	21	1.8	93.0
21	4	1.1	95.0	21	4	0.8	95.7	21	5	1.8	90.7	21	13	1.1	94.2
22	4	1.1	96.0	22	6	1.2	97.0	22	5	1.8	92.5	22	15	1.3	95.5
23	4	1.1	97.0	23	5	1.0	98.0	23	6	2.2	94.6	23	15	1.3	96.8
24	4	1.1	98.1	24	1	0.2	98.2	24	3	1.1	95.7	24	8	0.7	97.5
25-29	5	1.4	99.5	25-29	5	1.0	99.2	25-29	10	3.6	99.3	25-29	20	1.8	99.3
30-34	-	-	-	30-34	2	0.4	99.6	30-34	2	0.7	100.0	30-34	4	0.4	99.6
35 & Over	2	0.5	100.0	35 & Over	2	0.4	100.0	35 & Over	-	-	-	35 & Over	4	0.4	100.0
All Ages	365	100.0	-	All Ages	492	100.0	-	All Ages	279	100.0	-	All Ages	1,136	100.0	-

Note: Sex and age data were unavailable for 1,190 participants.

TCSU - Institutional Research
February 1982

FEMALE ENROLLED PARTICIPANT POPULATION BY AGE

Age	Non-Passers			Age	Placement Passers			Age	Credit Passers			Age	Total		
	N	Rel.%	Cum.%		N	Rel.%	Cum.%		N	Rel.%	Cum.%		N	Rel.%	Cum.%
16 & Under	8	1.9	1.9	16 & Under	14	2.1	2.1	16 & Under	18	2.9	2.9	16 & Under	40	2.3	2.3
17	328	77.7	79.6	17	545	82.3	84.4	17	429	68.5	71.4	17	1,302	76.1	78.5
18	60	14.2	93.8	18	60	9.1	93.5	18	65	10.4	81.8	18	185	10.8	89.3
19	14	3.3	97.2	19	18	2.7	96.2	19	14	2.2	84.0	19	46	2.7	92.0
20	2	0.5	97.6	20	6	0.9	97.1	20	13	2.1	86.1	20	21	1.2	93.2
21	1	0.2	98.0	21	2	0.3	97.4	21	11	1.8	87.9	21	14	0.8	94.0
22	2	0.5	98.3	22	-	-	-	22	11	1.8	89.6	22	13	0.8	94.8
23	1	0.2	98.6	23	3	0.5	97.9	23	4	0.6	90.3	23	8	0.5	95.3
24	1	0.2	98.8	24	3	0.5	98.3	24	9	1.4	91.7	24	13	0.8	96.0
25-29	3	0.7	99.5	25-29	4	0.6	98.9	25-29	29	4.6	96.3	25-29	36	2.1	98.1
30-34	1	0.2	99.8	30-34	2	0.3	99.2	30-34	10	1.6	97.9	30-34	13	0.8	98.9
35 & Over	1	0.2	100.0	35 & Over	5	0.8	100.0	35 & Over	13	2.1	100.0	35 & Over	19	1.1	100.0
All Ages	422	100.0	-	All Ages	662	100.0	-	All Ages	626	100.0	-	All Ages	1,710	100.0	-

Note: Sex and aga data were unavailable for 1,190 participants.

TCSU - Institutional Research
February 1982

DISTRIBUTION OF CONVERTED ESSAY SCORES OF TOTAL PARTICIPANT POPULATION

Score	Frequency	Relative Percent	Cumulative Percent
20-24	19	0.5	0.5
25-29	156	3.9	4.4
30-34	386	9.6	14.0
35-39	1,034	25.8	39.7
40-44	626	15.6	55.3
45-49	1,013	25.2	80.6
50-54	535	13.3	94.0
55-59	119	3.0	96.9
60-64	62	1.5	98.4
65-69	55	1.4	99.8
70-71	9	0.2	100.0
Total	4,014	100.0	-

Mean = 42.9 Median = 42.2 Std. Dev. = 8.2

DISTRIBUTION OF OBJECTIVE SCORES OF TOTAL PARTICIPANT POPULATION

Score	Frequency	Relative Percent	Cumulative Percent
21-24	10	0.2	0.2
25-29	117	2.9	3.1
30-34	439	10.9	14.0
35-39	691	17.1	31.1
40-44	920	22.8	53.9
45-49	787	19.5	73.4
50-54	559	13.9	87.3
55-59	288	7.1	94.4
60-64	155	3.8	98.3
65-69	55	1.4	99.6
70-74	12	0.3	99.9
75-77	3	0.1	100.0
Total	4,036	100.0	-

Mean = 44.1 Median = 43.4 Std. Dev. = 8.9

DISTRIBUTION OF COMPOSITE SCORES OF TOTAL PARTICIPANT POPULATION

Score	Frequency	Relative Percent	Cumulative Percent
47-49	7	0.2	0.2
50-59	88	2.2	2.4
60-69	390	9.7	12.1
70-79	764	19.0	31.1
80-89	1,119	27.8	59.0
90-99	865	21.5	80.5
100-109	479	11.9	92.5
110-119	184	4.6	97.1
120-129	91	2.3	99.3
130-139	23	0.6	99.9
140-147	4	0.1	100.0
Total	4,014	100.0	-

Mean = 87.1 Median = 86.0 Std. Dev. = 15.1

TCSU - Institutional Research
February, 1982

DISTRIBUTION OF CONVERTED ESSAY SCORES OF PARTICIPANTS WHO PASSED FOR CREDIT

Score	Frequency	Relative Percent	Cumulative Percent
42	16	1.3	1.3
45	238	19.4	20.7
48	285	23.2	44.0
51	265	21.6	65.6
54	189	15.4	81.0
58	110	9.0	90.0
62	59	4.8	94.8
65	34	2.8	97.6
68	15	1.2	98.8
69	6	0.5	99.3
70	5	0.4	99.7
71	4	0.3	100.0
Total	1,226	100.0	-

Mean = 51.5 Median = 50.8 Std. Dev. = 5.9

DISTRIBUTION OF OBJECTIVE SCORES OF PARTICIPANTS WHO PASSED FOR CREDIT

Score	Frequency	Relative Percent	Cumulative Percent
43-44	60	4.9	4.9
45-47	218	17.8	22.7
48-50	246	20.1	42.7
51-53	236	19.2	62.0
54-56	129	10.5	72.5
57-59	134	10.9	83.4
60-62	91	7.4	90.9
63-65	64	5.2	96.1
66-68	28	2.3	98.4
69-71	10	0.8	99.2
72-74	7	0.6	99.8
75-77	3	0.2	100.0
Total	1.226	100.0	-

Mean = 52.9 Median = 51.9 Std. Dev. = 6.4

DISTRIBUTION OF COMPOSITE SCORES OF PARTICIPANTS WHO PASSED FOR CREDIT

Score	Frequency	Relative Percent	Cumulative Percent
92-94	176	14.4	14.4
95-99	289	23.6	37.9
100-104	266	21.7	59.6
105-109	193	15.7	75.4
110-114	119	9.7	85.1
115-119	65	5.3	90.4
120-124	62	5.1	95.4
125-129	29	2.4	97.8
130-134	16	1.3	99.1
135-139	7	0.6	99.7
140-144	3	0.2	99.9
147	1	0.1	100.0
Total	1,226	100.0	-

Mean = 104.3 Median = 102.2 Std. Dev. = 9.8

TCSU - Institutional Research
February, 1982

141

DISTRIBUTION OF CONVERTED ESSAY SCORES OF PARTICIPANTS WHO DID NOT PASS FOR CREDIT

Score	Frequency	Relative Percent	Cumulative Percent
20-24	19	0.7	0.7
25-29	156	5.6	6.3
30-34	386	13.8	20.1
35-39	1,034	37.1	57.2
40-44	610	21.9	79.1
45-49	490	17.6	96.7
50-54	81	2.9	99.6
55-59	9	0.3	99.9
60-62	3	0.1	100.0
Total	2,788	100.0	-

Mean = 39.1 Median = 39.2 Std. Dev. = 6.0

DISTRIBUTION OF OBJECTIVE SCORES OF PARTICIPANTS WHO DID NOT PASS FOR CREDIT

Score	Frequency	Relative Percent	Cumulative Percent
21-24	9	0.3	0.3
25-29	113	4.1	4.4
30-34	433	15.5	19.9
35-39	686	24.6	44.5
40-44	855	30.7	75.2
45-49	416	14.9	90.1
50-54	183	6.6	96.7
55-59	72	2.6	99.2
60-64	17	0.6	99.9
65-68	4	0.1	100.0
Total	2,788	100.0	-

Mean = 40.4 Median = 40.1 Std. Dev. = 6.9

DISTRIBUTION OF COMPOSITE SCORES OF PARTICIPANTS WHO DID NOT PASS FOR CREDIT

Score	Frequency	Relative Percent	Cumulative Percent
47-49	7	0.3	0.3
50-54	37	1.3	1.6
55-59	51	1.8	3.4
60-64	133	4.8	8.2
65-69	257	9.2	17.4
70-74	326	11.7	29.1
75-79	438	15.7	44.8
80-84	548	19.7	64.5
85-89	571	20.5	84.9
90-94	316	11.3	96.3
95-99	84	3.0	99.3
100-104	20	0.7	100.0
Total	2,788	100.0	-

Mean = 79.5 Median = 80.9 Std. Dev. = 10.0

TCSU - Institutional Research
February, 1982

142

DISTRIBUTION OF CONVERTED ESSAY SCORES OF PARTICIPANTS WHO PASSED FOR CREDIT OR PLACEMENT

Score	Frequency	Relative Percent	Cumulative Percent
39	504	17.9	17.9
40-44	570	20.3	38.2
45-49	964	34.3	72.6
50-54	526	18.7	91.3
55-59	119	4.2	95.5
60-64	62	2.2	97.7
65-69	55	2.0	99.7
70-71	9	0.3	100.0
Total	2,809	100.0	-

Mean = 46.5 Median = 45.1 Std. Dev. = 6.5

DISTRIBUTION OF OBJECTIVE SCORES OF PARTICIPANTS WHO PASSED FOR CREDIT OR PLACEMENT

Score	Frequency	Relative Percent	Cumulative Percent
35-39	420	15.0	15.0
40-44	727	25.9	40.8
45-49	666	23.7	64.5
50-54	509	18.1	82.7
55-59	271	9.6	92.3
60-64	149	5.3	97.6
65-69	52	1.9	99.5
70-74	12	0.4	99.9
75-77	3	0.1	100.0
Total	2,809	100.0	-

Mean = 47.3 Median = 46.4 Std. Dev. = 7.6

DISTRIBUTION OF COMPOSITE SCORES OF PARTICIPANTS WHO PASSED FOR CREDIT OR PLACEMENT

Score	Frequency	Relative Percent	Cumulative Percent
74-79	237	8.4	8.4
80-89	949	33.8	42.2
90-99	843	30.0	72.2
100-109	478	17.0	89.2
110-119	184	6.6	95.8
120-129	91	3.2	99.0
130-139	23	0.8	99.9
140-147	4	0.1	100.0
Total	2,809	100.0	-

Mean = 93.8 Median = 91.8 Std. Dev. = 12.1

TCSU - Institutional Research
February, 1982

DISTRIBUTION OF CONVERTED ESSAY SCORES OF PARTICIPANTS WHO DID NOT PASS FOR CREDIT OR PLACEMENT

Score	Frequency	Relative Percent	Cumulative Percent
20-24	19	1.6	1.6
25-29	156	12.9	14.5
30-34	386	32.0	46.6
35-39	530	43.9	90.5
40-44	56	4.6	95.2
45-49	49	4.1	99.3
50-54	9	0.7	100.0
Total	1,205	100.0	-

Mean = 34.4 Median = 35.6 Std. Dev. = 5.0

DISTRIBUTION OF OBJECTIVE SCORES OF PARTICIPANTS WHO DID NOT PASS FOR CREDIT OR PLACEMENT

Score	Frequency	Relative Percent	Cumulative Percent
21-24	9	0.7	0.7
25-29	113	9.4	10.1
30-34	433	35.9	46.1
35-39	266	22.1	68.1
40-44	188	15.6	83.7
45-49	121	10.4	93.8
50-54	50	4.1	97.9
55-59	17	1.4	99.3
60-64	5	0.4	99.8
65-68	3	0.2	100.0
Total	1,205	100.0	-

Mean = 37.0 Median = 35.2 Std. Dev. = 7.3

DISTRIBUTION OF COMPOSITE SCORES OF PARTICIPANTS WHO DID NOT PASS FOR CREDIT OR PLACEMENT

Score	Frequency	Relative Percent	Cumulative Percent
47-49	7	0.6	0.6
50-54	37	3.1	3.7
55-59	51	4.2	7.9
60-64	133	11.0	18.9
65-69	257	21.3	40.2
70-74	299	24.8	65.1
75-79	228	18.9	84.0
80-84	122	10.1	94.1
85-89	48	4.0	98.1
90-94	16	1.3	99.4
95-99	6	0.5	99.9
100-104	1	0.1	100.0
Total	1,205	100.0	-

Mean = 71.4 Median = 71.5 Std. Dev. = 8.5

TCSU - Institutional Research
February, 1982

INTERCORRELATIONS AMONG GROUPED ESSAY AND COMPOSITE SCORES FOR THE TOTAL PARTICIPANT POPULATION

	Question 1	Question 2	Essay Total	Conv. Essay	Objective	Composite
Question 1		0.5560	0.8704	0.8659	0.4363	0.7261
Question 2			0.8697	0.8625	0.5456	0.7903
Essay Total				0.9930	0.5673	0.8715
Converted Essay					0.5678	0.8758
Objective						0.8946

INTERCORRELATIONS AMONG PART AND COMPOSITE SCORES FOR THE TOTAL PARTICIPANT POPULATION

	Essay No. 1		Essay No. 2					
	Read.1	Read.2	Read.1	Read.2	Essay Total	Essay Conv.	Objective	Composite
Essay No. 1								
Read. 1	0.7404		0.4845	0.4836	0.8088	0.8051	0.4112	0.6769
Read. 2			0.4767	0.4837	0.8040	0.7999	0.4026	0.6689
Essay No. 2								
Read. 1				0.7282	0.8041	0.7974	0.5050	0.7291
Read. 2					0.8034	0.7973	0.5095	0.7321
Essay Total						0.9930	0.5673	0.8715
Essay Conv.							0.5678	0.8758
Objective								0.8946

TCSU - Institutional Research
February 1982

DISTRIBUTION OF PARTICIPANT POPULATION
BY ENROLLED CAMPUS

Campus	Passing for Credit		Passing for Placement		Not Passing		Total	
	Number	Percent Campus Enrolled	Number	Percent Campus Enrolled	Number	Percent Campus Enrolled	Number	Percent Total Enrolled
Bakersfield	2	14.3	9	64.3	3	21.4	14	0.5
Chico	61	29.0	89	42.4	60	28.6	210	7.3
Dominguez Hills	5	22.7	4	18.2	13	59.1	22	0.8
Fresno	51	27.9	78	42.6	54	29.5	183	6.4
Fullerton	88	37.3	86	36.4	62	26.3	236	8.3
Hayward	30	56.6	15	28.3	8	15.1	53	1.9
Humboldt	34	35.4	39	40.6	23	24.0	96	3.4
Long Beach	79	25.9	133	43.6	93	30.5	305	10.7
Los Angeles	23	26.4	22	25.3	42	48.3	87	3.0
Northridge	65	34.4	73	38.6	51	27.0	189	6.6
Pomona	80	27.5	131	45.0	80	27.5	291	10.2
Sacramento	70	38.3	81	44.3	32	17.5	183	6.4
San Bernardino	3	25.0	2	16.7	7	58.3	12	0.4
San Diego	135	28.9	183	39.2	149	31.9	467	16.3
San Francisco	25	46.3	16	29.6	13	24.1	54	1.9
San Jose	45	48.9	26	28.3	21	22.8	92	3.2
San Luis Obispo	97	31.2	144	46.3	70	22.5	311	10.9
Sonoma	3	12.0	11	44.0	11	44.0	25	0.9
Stanislaus	10	33.3	12	40.0	8	26.7	30	1.0
All Campuses	906	31.7	1,154	40.3	800	28.0	2,860	100.0

TCSU - Institutional Research
February 1982

EEE READERS/TABLE LEADERS, 1973-1981

The following faculty have served as readers or table leaders at English Equivalency Examination readings.

Bakersfield

Cartwright, Michael 73, 78
Cohn, Jill 76, 77
Flachmann, Mike 78
Green, Don 80, 81
Iyasere, Soloman 73, 74,75, 77, 79, 80, 81

Chico

Brown, Clark 73, 76, 77, 79
Dunlap, Lennis 74 thru 81
Elliott, Lynn 73
Hatch, Karen 79, 81
Lams, Vic 73, 78
Megibow, Carol 80, 81
Nordhus, Phil 73
Prince, Gilbert 73, 74, 75, 80
Veith, Don 73, 74, 75

Dominguez Hills

Rankin, David 76 thru 80
Yamada, Agnes 73 thru 81

Dominguez Hills, Small College

Sutton, Marilyn 75, 76, 79, 81

Fresno

Chittick, Roger 81
Cowling, William 77
Frey, James 73, 74, 75, 79, 81
Kausch, Donald 76
McDermott, Jack 74, 76
McKnight, Ray 75, 78, 80
Pickering, Jean 79, 80
Seib, Kenneth 78, 80, 81

Fullerton

Fuller, Cynthia 75
Heubner, Wayne 73, 74
Holland, Michael 73, 76, 77, 79, 80
Klammer, Thomas 73, 74
Lynn, Joanne 77, 81
Neilson, Keith 73, 74, 76, 78, 80
Stupple, A. J. 73, 74, 75
White, John 73 thru 79, 81

Hayward

Boyd, Zelda 73
Conner, Jack 73 thru 81
Fuchs, Jake 78, 79, 81
Murphy, E. J. 76
Pemberton, Bill 73, 74

Humboldt

Boxer, David 81
Burroughts, Robert 73, 76, 78
Dalsant, John Barry 77, 78, 79, 81
Day, Richard 73, 74, 75, 79, 80,
Sinclair, Giles 73

Long Beach

Borowiec, Ed 73, 74, 75, 77, 80, 81
Brekke, Alice 73, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81
Lim, Paulino 80
Lothamer, Eileen 73, 75 thru 81
May, Charles 73, 74, 78, 79, 80
Mittleman, Les 73
Peterson, Audrey 81
Wylder, Bob 73 thru 77

Los Angeles

Brand, Harry 80, 81
Brier, Peter 80
Carter, Katherine 77 thru 80
Cleman, John 78, 79, 80
Hodgman, Robert 73 thru 77
Osio, Elaine 73 thru 76, 81
Sullivan, James 73, 79

Northridge

Andersen, David 76, 77
Arthur, Tony 73, 74, 75, 77, 78, 79, 81
Blakeslee, Richard 80
Klotz, Marvin 73, 74, 75, 80
Lane, Arthur 76, 77, 79
Larson, Gale 81
Noreen, Robert 73, 75, 80
Stewart, Lawrence 73
Van Slooten, Henry 74, 75
Walsh, William 78, 79
Wedin, Warren 81

Pomona

Bellman, Samuel 73
Cook, Stanley 73, 76, 77, 79
Elliott, J. Thomas 75
Fulbeck, Jack 73, 74
Humphrey, Theodore 73
Holder, Carol 80
Levitt, Harold 80, 81
Metwalli, Ahmed 73
Moss, Andy 80
Okada, Victor 73, 74, 75
Sisney, Mary 81
Stavros, George 73
Suter, Richard 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78
Wilds, Lillian 78 thru 81

Sacramento

Bell, David 79
Hanson-Smith, Elizabeth 73, 77
Hohlwein, Kathryn 76
Hubbard, Frank 77
Moore, Charles 73, 80
Nelson, Charles 74
Olmstead, Robert 73
Price, Jon 74, 78, 80
Santora, Ron 75
Thornton, Hortense 78 thru 81
Maxwell, Joan 81

San Bernardino

Doane, Margaret 77 thru 80
Golden, Bruce 73
Koon, Helene 80
Kramer, Larry 73 thru 81
MacPike, Loralee 80
Mayo, Clark 73, 74
Schroeder, Peter 79, 81

San Diego

Boe, Alfred 73
Brown, Ruth 77, 78, 81
Chater, Elizabeth 76
McLeod, Dan 74, 75, 79, 80, 81
Nelson, Thomas 73, 76
Neumann, Bonnie 80
Neumeyer, Peter 80
Nichols, Prescott 73, 79
Sandstrom, Glen 74, 75, 76, 78

San Francisco

Axelrod, Joseph 80, 81
Brogan, James 73
Grundt, Eugene 74
Hall, Robert 74
Josephson, Clifford 74, 75, 76, 79
Kohn, James 77, 78
Ranaker, David 75
Robinson, William 73, 74, 75, 81
Weltner, Peter 73
Wolf, Manfred 80

San Jose

Buerger, Dan 75, 77, 78, 79, 80
Burbank, Rex 73 thru 81
Cox, Martha 73, 74, 75
Crockett, Wilbert 73, 74, 75, 81
Elliott, Jeanne 76
Gordon, Bob 78
Grant, George 79, 80
Haeger, Jack 73, 74, 81
Hymas, Scott 73
Keesey, Don 76, 77
Okerlund 73, 74, 75, 77
Rice, Scott 76
Robinson, Marion 81
Steele, Shelby 77,80

San Luis Obispo

Brenner, Patricia 77, 78
Cairns, Edward 73, 75, 76, 77
Currier, Susan 81
Darnielle, Max 73, 74
Harrington, John 79
Kann, David 73, 79
Kastner, George 73
Kerr, John F. 73
Landwehr, Alfred 78
McDonnell, Robert 76, 77
Rollings, David 74

Sonoma

Bullen, J. S. 76, 77, 78
Ewen, Sally 73, 75, 78
Gottlieb, Judith 81
Hendrickson, Richard 79, 81
Kormier, James 74, 81
Sandy, Alan 80

Stanislaus

Carroll, John 75
Finley, Pete 73
Fuller, Michael 81
Johnson, Lola 79, 81
Phillips, William 77
Quevedo, Barbara 78, 80
Settera, George 74
Williams, Jack 76